

MODERN LANGUAGE NOTES

CONTENTS

	PAGE
SUMMERS, MONTAGUE.—Mrs. Gordon Smythies,	350
KURRELMEYER, W.—German Lexicography. Part X,	364
ZEYDEL, E. H.—On the Two Minor Poems in the Hrotsvitha Codex,	373
BAUM, P. F.—Chaucer's "Glorious Legende,"	377
CARPENTER, NAN COOKE.—A Note on Chaucer's Mother,	382
KOLLER, KATHRINE.—Falstaff and the Art of Dying,	383
SHAABER, M. A.—"A Living Drollery" ('Tempest,' III, iii, 21),	387
OLIVER, L. M.—Rowley, Foze, and the 'Faustus' Additions,	391
SMITH, ROLAND M.—Spenser and Milton: an Early Analogue,	394
ALLEN, D. C.—John Donne's "Paradise and Calvarie,"	398
LANCASTER, H. C.—'Avant de' Plus the Infinitive,	401
CHAMBERS, F. MCM.—Completion of a Text of Raïmbaut d'Aurenga,	404
DEEN, F. H.—A Comparison of Simms's 'Richard Hurdia' with Its Sources,	406
GIBBENS, V. E.—Hawthorne's Note to "Dr. Heidegger's Experiment,"	408
KURRELMEYER, W.—An Early Schiller Letter,	410

REVIEWS:—

G. F. SENSABAUGH, <i>The Tragic Muse of John Ford</i> . [O. J. Campbell.]	411
G. E. BENTLEY, <i>Shakespeare & Jonson, their reputations in the seventeenth century compared</i> . [Alfred Harbage.]	414
GEORGE GORDON, <i>Shakespearean Comedy and Other Studies</i> . [M. A. Shaaber.]	417
HARDIN CRAIG (ed.), <i>Machiavelli's The Prince, An Elizabethan Translation</i> . [A. H. Gilbert.]	418
A. E. MORGAN, <i>Edward Bellamy</i> . [W. F. Taylor.]	420
F. L. UTLEY, <i>The Crooked Rib</i> . [Haldeen Braddy.]	421
E. S. LE COMTE, <i>Endymion in England</i> . [D. T. Starnes.]	423
MARK LONGAKER, <i>Ernest Dowson</i> . [Arthur Mizener.]	424
SISTER MARY CHRYSOSTOM DIEBELS, <i>Peter Markoe (1752?-1792): A Philadelphia Writer</i> . [L. M. Miner.]	425
BRIEF MENTION: G. CHINARD (ed.), <i>La Jeune Indienne</i> , par CHAMFORT; J. W. BEACH, <i>A Romantic View of Poetry</i> ,	426
CORRESPONDENCE: Zu Oskar Seidlin's "Das Etwas und das Nichts"; Gerhart Hauptmann,	428
NECROLOGY BERT JOHN VOS,	430

MODERN LANGUAGE NOTES

A Monthly Publication with intermission from July to October (inclusive)

Edited by H. CARRINGTON LANCASTER

WILLIAM KURRELMEYER
RAYMOND D. HAVENS
KEMP MALONE

C. S. SINGLETON
CHARLES R. ANDERSON
DON CAMERON ALLEN

Advisory Editors

E. Feise, Grace Frank, J. C. French, E. Malakis, R. B. Roulston, Pedro Salinas, L. Spitzer

The Subscription Price of the current annual volume is \$5.00 for the United States and Mexico and \$5.50 for other countries included in the Postal Union. Single issues, price seventy-five cents.

Contributors and Publishers should send manuscripts and books for review to the Editors of Modern Language Notes, The Johns Hopkins University, Baltimore, Md., indicating on the envelope whether the contribution concerns English, German, or Romance. Every manuscript should be accompanied by a stamped and addressed return envelope. In accepting articles for publication, the editors will give preference to those submitted by subscribers to the journal. Foot-notes should be numbered continuously throughout each article; titles of books and journals should be italicized; titles of articles enclosed in quotation marks. Quotation marks are *not* used in verse quotations that form a paragraph. Write II, 3, *not* vol. II, p. 3. The following abbreviations are approved: *DNB.*, *JEGP.*, *MLN.*, *MLR.*, *MP.*, *NED.*, *PMLA.*, *PQ.*, *RR.*, *SP.*, *RES.*, *TLS.* Proof and MS. should be returned to the *editors* with an indication of the total number of reprints desired. Subscriptions and other business communications should be sent to The Johns Hopkins Press, Baltimore 18, Maryland.

THE CRITICAL WORKS OF JOHN DENNIS

EDITED BY EDWARD NILES HOOKER

VOLUME II 1711-1729

This volume completes the publication of the entire body of Dennis's literary criticism. For many years scorned and neglected, Dennis has come into his own as the first professional literary critic in England, as the first great protagonist of John Milton, and as the champion of Molière, Corneille, Racine, Shakespeare, Dryden, Æthérée, Wycherley, and Congreve. General appreciation of the value of Dennis's work has hitherto been impossible because most of it is rare, costly, and difficult to come at. Only five of his numerous critical writings have been reprinted in our country. Besides the text of the essays, this edition contains a long introduction on the significance of Dennis's contributions to literary theory and criticism, over two hundred pages of Explanatory Notes which outline all of the main movements in Augustan criticism, and a full, workable Index.

Volume I. Pp. xi + 537. Price, \$5.00—Volume II. Pp. cxliv + 588. Price, \$7.50

THE JOHNS HOPKINS PRESS BALTIMORE 18

Entered as Second-Class Matter at the Baltimore, Maryland, Postoffice
Acceptance for mailing at special rate of postage provided for in Section 1108,
Act of Congress of July 16, 1894.

pitzer

editors
on the
script
articles
to the
les of
Quo-
3, not
MP.,
editors
business

Modern Language Notes

Volume LX

JUNE, 1945

Number 6

MRS. GORDON SMYTHIES

Although one of the most popular and prolific of Victorian novelists, and in her day a figure of note both in literary and social circles, the name of Mrs. Gordon Smythies has been so undeservedly and so completely forgotten that save for a bare dozen inaccurate and superficial lines in the *Modern English Biography*, III (1901), of Frederic Boase, who derives from Allibone's *Critical Dictionary of English Literature*, II (1877), 2170, and "Supplement," II, 1366, no notice of this lady is to be found, whilst even the catalogues of our great National Libraries have made several mistakes in recording her name, and perpetuated errors and confusion when listing her works.

Harriette Maria Gordon was the daughter of Edward Gordon of Sunninghill, Berks, and Jane, *née* Halliday, his wife. The date of her birth has not been traced. Curiously enough, her name does not appear in the Register of Baptisms of Sunninghill Parish Church, although the Vicar of Sunninghill, the Rev. G. A. R. Thursfield, who kindly searched the Registers on my behalf, informs me that the names of her two brothers, Alexander Lesmore Gordon, born 13 May, baptized 26 December, 1814, and John Henry Gordon, born 18 November, 1815, baptized 21 July, 1816, are duly entered. Research and inquiries in other directions, notably at Weeley Heath, Essex, for which I have to thank the Rector, the Rev. J. M. Harston Morris, and in the Registers of the parish where the Gordons had their Town house, St. Marylebone, for which I have to thank the Rector, the Rev. H. J. Matthews, have all proved fruitless. One may hazard 1816-17.

Edward Gordon was of the Lesmoir Gordons, and his niece,

Charlotte Clarke, married in 1835, John Keble, author of *The Christian Year*. Ten years previously, in 1825, Keble's younger brother, the Rev. Thomas Keble, who was for forty-two years vicar of Bisley, Glos, had married Elizabeth Jane Clarke, the elder sister of Charlotte.

Harriette Maria Gordon's first work, a poem, *The Bride of Siena*, was published anonymously, post-octavo, 5s.6d., cloth, Saunders and Otley, 1835. She dates the Preface from London, 15 June, 1835. The theme is the story of La Pia:

Ricorditi di me che son La Pia!
Siena mi fe', disfecemi Maremma.

Dante, "Purgatorio," v, 133-4.

The Metropolitan Magazine judged Miss Gordon's poem to be "romantic and pathetic in a high degree," and her verses are certainly fluent and pleasing. A second edition was called for in 1838, in which year she also published her first novel, *Fitzherbert; or, Lovers and Fortune-Hunters*. Her Preface modestly says that although "the town went mad after 'Ernest Maltravers' . . . what can the humble *débutante* expect?" She achieved, none the less, an exceptional success, and *The Gentleman's Magazine*, August, 1838, pp. 169-70, paid *Fitzherbert* the tribute of a lengthy and most eulogistic notice.

Her next work, *Cousin Geoffrey, The Old Bachelor, A Novel, To which is added Claude Stocq*, was "Edited by Theodore Hook, Esq.," 3 vols., Bentley, 1840. Without revealing her name, Hook speaks of her as "a lady most favourably known to the public," and explains that the reason for including "Claude Stocq: A Tale of the Sixteenth Century. From the French," and not from the pen of the gifted young lady, was merely because "Cousin Geoffrey" proved hardly long enough to fill the regulation three volumes upon which circulating libraries insisted. Cousin Geoffrey St. Aubyn, the kindly good-natured old fellow, everybody's friend, is an excellent character, and it comes as no small surprise when we find that he is identical with the darkly-plotting villainous Mr. Merton. In fact we are strongly reminded of Le Fanu, who later was so powerfully to work this vein. *Cousin Geoffrey*, which was more than once reprinted, firmly established the reputation of the anonymous authoress. Similar novels followed, *The Marrying Man*, 3 vols., 1841, and *The Matchmaker*, 3 vols., 1842.

On the 3rd. March, 1842, at St. Mary's, Bryanston Square, Miss Gordon married William Yorick Smythies. This remarkable man was born on the 10th. October, 1816. He was at Shrewsbury from 1832-5, and *ætat.* 19, matriculated at Oxford on the 10th. December, 1835. A member of Trinity College, he proceeded B. A. in 1839. From 1844-49 he was Vicar of Shilbottle, near Alnwick, Northumberland; from 1849-56, Vicar of Buckland in Dover. Shortly after 1856 he took up his residence at Hillside House, Weeley, which he had himself built, and for many years he acted as Inspector of Schools for the Dioceses of Rochester and St. Albans. He was Rector of West Mersey, Essex, from 1893-97, in which latter year, being (although past eighty) very vigorous and energetic, he was appointed to the valuable living of Algarkirk, Lincoln. On the 6th November, 1883, he had married *en secondes nocces*, Anna Maria, daughter of Captain Henry Fage Belson, R. N. He died at Algarkirk Hall on the 2nd. July, 1910, having been born in the reign of George III, and having survived until the reign of George V. By his first wife there were four children, one daughter, Ellen, born on the 1st January, 1846; died unmarried, 1866; and three sons. The second son, William Gordon Smythies, (1849-1909), married his cousin Charlotte Mary, daughter of the Rev. Thomas Keble and niece of the author of *The Christian Year*. William Gordon Smythies published in 1869 a book of verse, *Golden Leisures*, and is the author of *Original Recitations*, and three playlets, all printed in 1893, as well as a duologue, *Mystification*, 1898.

The Jilt, 1844, the first novel to be written by Mrs. Gordon Smythies after her marriage, at once became a great favourite, and was reprinted in popular form, 1858 and 1862. *The Breach of Promise*, 1845, was also exceedingly well received, and later appeared as No. 186 of the "Parlour Library." In quick succession followed *The Life of a Beauty*, 3 vols., 1846; *A Warning to Wives; or, The Platonic Lover*, 1847; *Courtship and Wedlock*, 1850; and *The Bride Elect*, 1852.

During the year 1853 Mrs. Smythies suffered from a long and distressing illness. The physicians ordered complete rest, than which nothing could have been more irksome to a woman of so many activities, and in spite of all remonstrance she insisted upon finishing *The Prince and the People*, *A Poem, In Two Cantos*, published by Skeffington in 1854. The unpopularity, at the moment,

of the Prince Consort had roused her to champion him warmly, but her inspiration by no means matches her loyalty. *Sebastapol, A Poem*, Routledge, 1854, is not only tepid, but is sadly overbalanced by more than fifty pages of annotation. In fine, an excellent novelist, she proved herself no poetess. It should be remarked that upon the title-pages of these pieces she is designated Mrs. Yorick Smythies.

Upon the title-pages of her novels these are usually said to be by "The Author of 'Cousin Geoffrey'," or by Mrs. Gordon Smythies. She only signs herself Mrs. Yorick Smythies to these two poems. The explanation is that her husband much disliked her output of fiction. A poem might be approved, and a novel or two (if anonymous) tolerated, but so rapid a succession of romances was not to be endured. A man of forceful and imperious character, he did not hesitate to express his views pretty strongly to his lady, only to find that he was confronted by a personality as inflexible and unbending as his own. In the case of another Victorian novelist, it may be remembered that Mrs. Annie French Hector, whose pen-name was Mrs. Alexander, and who married Alexander Hector in 1857, during the lifetime of her husband—he died in 1875—published very little on account of his intense aversion to writing as a woman's vocation.

In the Smythies household other and far more serious differences arose. A contemporary, who saw Mrs. Gordon Smythies, in conversation describes her as "a tall beautiful woman." Moving much in literary circles she did not lack admirers, and amongst these (it is said) was Harrison Ainsworth, who received scant encouragement. She was, however, particularly friendly with Bulwer, Lord Lytton, who helped her very generously in her novels, as must be obvious to any reader of her pages—the word "collaborated" has even been used. The Rev. Yorick Smythies insisted that this intimacy should cease, upon which Mrs. Smythies at some date about 1862 left Hillside House, Weeley, and went to reside in London. She only once returned to Weeley, some 3 or 4 years later, to take charge of and remove thence her daughter, Ellen, who was dangerously ill, and who died in 1866. That the sympathies of her husband's family were entirely with Mrs. Smythies, seems certain from the fact that she was then staying at Headgate House, Colchester, with her brother-in-law, Francis Smythies (1811-88), who was a much respected figure and three times Mayor of the town.

For ten years Mrs. Smythies was exceptionally active. In 1857 appeared *Married for Love*, 3 vols., and in 1858, *A Lover's Quarrel; or, The County Ball*, 3 vols., both novels far above the average. In 1860 she published *Hope Evermore; or Something to do*, and, in Blackwood's London Library, *The Male Flirt; or Ladies beware of him*. Price one shilling, in whity-pink boards with gold decoration, *The Compliments of the Season; or A Merry Christmas and a Happy New Year*, 1860, is all "Pantomimes and Tips, Astley's and Madame Tussaud's, roast turkey, roast beef, mince pies, plum-pudding, wassail bowls, Yule logs, snowballs, slides, skating in the Regent's Park or on the Serpentine," thoroughly Dickensian jollity. 1861 saw no less than five books from Mrs. Gordon Smythies, and it is surprising what good fare each one of these proves to be—*The Daily Governess, or, Self-Dependence; Alone in the World; My Pretty Cousin, or, A Long Engagement*; and a couple of *London Journal* serials, *Our Mary; or, Murder will Out*, and *The Girl we Leave Behind us*. It may be remarked that when J. and R. Maxwell published *Our Mary* in volume form in 1880 the vast majority of readers took it to be an entirely new romance.

Hitherto the reviewers had shown themselves almost uniformly friendly to Mrs. Smythies, but the tocsin sounded. *The Quarterly Review*, April, 1863, launched a bitter attack upon "Sensation Novels," and pilloried the authoress of *The Daily Governess* alongside Miss Braddon (the chief of all offenders), Wilkie Collins, Mrs. Henry Wood, and many lesser names. For any discussion of these acrimonious, and indeed unscrupulous, criticisms much space would be necessary, and it must suffice to say that seemingly there were no lengths of vituperation and censure to which the opponents of "feverish fiction," as they dubbed it, were not prepared to proceed.

In 1862-3 Mrs. Gordon Smythies serialized in *The London Journal* *The Woman in Black*—not to be confounded with Miss Florence Warden's *A Lady in Black*, 1896; in 1863-4, *The Man in Grey*; and in 1865, *The Sleep-Walker; or Lady Theresa's Trials*. Other works of fiction followed one another rapidly: in 1862, *True to the Last*; in 1863, *Left to Themselves*; in 1864, *Guilty, or Not Guilty*; in 1865, *A Faithful Woman*; in 1867, *Idols of Clay*. Mrs. Smythies contributed an admirable ghost story "The Spectre Bridegroom" to the Extra Christmas Number of *The London Journal*, 1867. "Incurable! . . . A Poem . . . written in aid of the funds

of the Royal Hospital for Incurables," 4to. 1863, is (as such things used to be) negligible. In 1870 she published *Acquitted*, and in 1875 the last, and (in my judgement) by far the weakest of her many novels, *Eva's Fortune*.

Allibone and *The English Catalogue* give her five more titles, of which one, *Fit to be a Duchess*, 1860, may be a correct attribution. Lacking further evidence, I should question the other four works so assigned.

The Times, 21st. August, 1883, has: "On the 15th. inst., deeply lamented, after a long and severe illness Harriette Maria Gordon, Authoress, wife of the Rev. W. Y. Smythies, of Hill Side House, Weeley, Essex." This notice was inserted by her favourite and only surviving son, William Gordon Smythies, of Richmond, Surrey, who was devotedly attached to his mother. The Rev. William Yorick Smythies, who was then 67 years old, honoured the memory of his beautiful and accomplished wife by remarrying less than three months after her decease.

MONTAGUE SUMMERS

*Richmond, Surrey,
England*

GERMAN LEXICOGRAPHY

PART X

The material presented in this article is drawn from Hieronymus Bock's *New Kreütter Buch*, Straßburg, 1539. See *MLN.*, LX, 157.

LAVAMENT, n.: Eyn decoction von Chamillen gemacht, gibt eyn schön Lauament zû den bösen stinckenden wunden (I, 39^a): not in Weigand.

LAXIEREN: Das kraut . . . mit Saltz, essig, vnd baum öl gessen, laxiert den harten bauch (I, 41^b); Die wurtzel . . . erweycht vnd laxiert den harten bauch (63^b): Weigand cites Rot (1571).

LECKERBISZLEIN, n.: ist nun mehr auch (wie ander lecker bißlin) ins Teütsch land kommen (I, 61^a): not in *DWb*, which cites *Leckerbissen* from B. Waldis.

LECKMAUL, n.: eyn liebliche speiß für die leckmeuler (I, 61^b);

vmb seiner süßen wurtzelen willen, wans die leckmeuler wüsten, das es also güt wer im Sallat, sie wurden etwan der Spargen . . . lieber dann dises krauts emperen (80^a); gesunder vnd krefftiger pleiben dann die Leckmeüler Catij vnd Apicij (II, 24^a); wann sie zweymal kocht oder gewermpt worden, das die leckmeüler . . . vom Kölkraut eyn sprichwort machten . . . dz wir durch solche Apicianer vnd leckmeüler vil gütter gemeynen speiß . . . nit mehr achten (43^a); Im fröling lassen die leckmeüler die jungen dolden der Hopffen zûm salat bereyten. (68^a): *DWb* refers to *Leckermaul*, cited from *Felsenburg* and *Stieler*.

LECKSPEISE, f.: das haben die Apicianische leckspis vnd geneschige schmeckbrätlin, die stets in der kuchen stecken, erfunden (II, 51^a): not in *DWb*, which cites *Leckerspeise* from *Stieler* and *Oken*.

LEMURE, f.: eyns kampffs der listigen spitzigen vnnd behenden Laruen vnnd Lemuren, die mich werden anfechten mit jrem gauckeln (I, 173^a): *Weigand* cites *Goethe*.

LEUCHTSEL, n.: Wolan die Aegypter haben von disem gewächs jr liecht vnd leuchtsel müssen nemen (I, 82^b): not in *DWb*.

LEINSAMEN, m.: Diser somen mit leinsomen vnd dauben mist in wein gesotten . . . zertheylet die kröpff (II, 28^b): *DWb* cites *Frisch* (1741).

LINSENBLÄTTLEIN, n.: netz federn, die sint mit den aller kleynsten lynsen bletlin bekleydet (I, 157^a); Das erst kleyn kreütlin mit den Lynsen bletlin . . . auch *Phacoides* heyst, das ist Lynsenbletlin *ib.*; so bald man die selben Lynsen bletlin abstrupffet, ist das Kesten braun hor (158^a): not in *DWb*.

LUNGENKRAUT, n.: Von Lungenkraut vnd Brunnen leberkraut (I, 155^a); Das ander so man Lungenkraut nent, wechst an den mosichten Eychbäumen . . . also zehe ist das walt Lungen kraut (155^b): *DWb* cites no example.

LUNGWURZ: Die hirtten vnd vihe meyster Veterenarij, brauchen das Lungen kraut oder Lungwurtz gepüluert (I, 156^a): *DWb* cites no example.

LUSTKRAUT, n.: zilen die zû Straßburg in den gärten, für eyn lustkraut, sol erstmals von Leon auß Franckreich kommen sein (I, 69^a): not in *DWb*.

MAGENGILB, f.: Wann yemants die magengilb hette, der neme die forderste junge schöß der bletter (II, 44^a): *DWb* cites Tabernaemontanus (1588); the passage cited agrees verbatim with Bock.

MÄGEREI, f.: Die weiber baden die junge kindlin mit disem kraut in wasser gesotten so mit der Mägerei vnd kleyne rauhen grind beladen sint (I, 146^a): *DWb* cites Tabernaemontanus.

MARGENDISTEL, f.: vnd sagen sie heyß Margen distel, Frawen distel, vnd Vehe distel, zû latein Labrum Veneris et Carduus Marie (II, 78^a): *DWb* cites no example.

MASZSÜSSEL: Maßlieben heyst man im Westerich Zeitlößlin, im bistumb Speyer Massüsselen, zû Latein Primula veris (I, 41^a): *DWb* cites Nemnich.

MAUERRAUTE, f.: Maur rauten vnd Roter Steinbrech . . . Die Maurraut wechst auß den rissen . . . der mauren (I, 157^b); Maurrauten nent man allenthalben capillum veneris (158^a); Es würt sunst die Mauerraut . . . wasser Coriander genent (158^b): *DWb* cites Maaler.

MAUERRÄUTLEIN, n.: das haben wir dem lieben Maurrautlin vnd roten Steynbrechlin zû lob wöllen anzeygen (I, 158^b): not in *DWb*.

MILZKRAUT, n.: es solt nit alleyn Splenion als Miltzkraut . . . heyssen . . . vnd möcht wol Miltzkraut oder Monkraut heyssen (I, 163^b): *DWb* cites Tabernaemontanus.

MODELGEER: Von Modelgeer . . . Modelgeer das man auff vngewachten äckern, rechen, neben den strassen, vnnd auff den almüten findet, nennen etlich auch Creutzwurtz . . . Die alten weiber sagen Modelgeer sei aller wurtzel eyn Eer (I, 70^b): *DWb* cites Maaler.

MÖNCHSKOPF, m.: stehn die rörlin mit den weissen beschornen, runden blatten ledig, wie die nackete Münchs köpff (I, 73^b): *DWb* cites Nemnich.

MÖNCHSPLATTE, f.: verwelcken die rörlin sampt den beschornen Münchs platten (I, 73^b): *DWb* cites no example.

MONDKRAUT, f.: see under *Miltzkraut*, above: *DWb* cites Nemnich.

MOOSBLUME, f.: Dise Blüm hab ich Moßblumen hören deütschen,

vnd Dotterblümen vmb der farben willen, vnd auch geel weißblümen (I, 36^a): *DWb* cites Lohenstein.

MUCKENKRAUT, n.: Eyn köstlich mucken kraut . . . daruff sitzt kein muck oder flieg nimmer mer . . . flöchkraut, dweil es die flöhe vertreibt, hieß wol muckenkraut, oder wasser pfeffer (I, 22^a): *DWb* cites Stieler.

MUNDGESCHWER, n.: Reinigt vnd heylet die feüle vnd mundgeschwer darmit geweschen (I, 3^a): not in *DWb*.

MUTTERWEH, n.: machen die weiber bäder, fomenta, vnnd secklin . . . für das bauch vnd mütter wee (I, 39^a); erweckt die weiber, welche von dem Mütterwee etwan nider fallen, als weren sie dot, die werden . . . wider aufferweckt (173^b): *DWb* cites Sebiz (1580).

NARRENBLOME, f.: folgens werden wir der Narren blümen wider gedennen (II, 55^b): not in *DWb*.

OFFIZIN, f.: das würt aber nit dise schell, sunder eyn anders sein, das die officine verkauffen (I, 121^b); Vnsere officine vnnd kuchen meyster der Apotecker, nennen vnnd geben sie für Scolopendria (163^b): Weigand cites Wächtler (1703).

OPERATION, f.: Obernente würckung, schreibt man auch dem gebranten wasser zů, aber in der operation nit so mechtig (I, 96^b); Das gebrant wasser von Peterlin soll gleiche operation haben (137^b): Weigand cites Mathesius (1562).

OPERIEREN: pilulas formieren, vnd den krancken (wie vorgesagt) eingeben, die operieren oben vnd vnden mit kleynem schmerzten (I, 85^b): Weigand cites Rot (1571).

PARADEISHOLZ, n.: von Balsam, Paradeisholtz, Amomo, Nardis (I, 42^a): *DWb* cites *Paradiesholz* from Stieler.

PULVERISIEREN: bey vilen schäfferen warnemen, welche dise wurtzel gepuluerisiert vnd mit saltz vermischet jren krancken schäfflin zů lecken fürtragen (I, 16^a); hab er der Münch die wurtzel puluerisiert, vnnd dem hund auch geben (70^a); Mastiche eyn quinten, jedes sunderlich puluerisiert (85^b): *DWb* cites Roth *dict*.

QUECKET, ptc.: das stöst jürlich von seiner weissen quecketen vnd kriechenden wurtzel, dünne runde stengelin (II, 76^a): *DWb* cites the verb *quecken* from Rädlein (1711).

QUITTENLAUB, n.: verglych es sich dem quitten laub (I, 6^b): not in *DWb*.

RADENDISTEL, f.: Von Manßtrew, Brachendistel vnd Radendistel, Das xli. Capitel (II, 84^a); mit diser wallen oder Brachendistel, die auch zû teutsch Manßtrew, Ellend vnnd Radendistel heyst (84^b): *DWb* cites Maaler.

RAMSEREN: Otho von Brunnenfels sagt diser wild Knoblauch heysß im Oberland Ramseren, das ist Gerinsel, drumb das die milch vom safft des Knoblauchs gerinnet vnd zûsamen laufft. Es ist aber dis gewechs nichts anderst dann schlangen Knoblauch, *Allium Colubrinum* (II, 51^b): *DWb* cites no example.

RASSELKRAUT, n.: Die kreüter nent man Rassel, vnd flöchkraut, dweil es die flöhe vertreibt (I, 22^a): *DWb* gives no example.

RAUTENSAFT, m.: Rautten safft in die oren gethon, Legt nider das stechen (I, 18^a): *DWb* cites Sebiz.

REKTIFIZIEREN: mit jren milch wurtzeln . . . gesamlet werden sollen, als dann geredificiert vnd auffgehaben (I, 84^b): not in Weigand.

RESOLVIEREN: Derhalben resoluieren vnnd zertheylen sie, harte geschwulst, knollen, beulen vnnd anders (I, 1^b); seind dienstlich zû dempffen, zû erwermen vnd zû resoluieren (5^a); sie auch resoluieren vnd zertheylen die zâhen feüchtigkeyt der Lungen (7^b); alle eüsserliche geschwer am gantzen leib, mit Pappel kraut wurtzel vnnd samen, resoluieren vnnd weych machen . . . eyn pflaster machen, vnd darauff schlagen, das resoluiert, zertheylet vnnd erweycht alle hitzige geschwer (106^b): not in Weigand.

RESTITUIERN: das die ordenung von Libanotide widerumb restituiert, vnd an tag brocht werd (I, 58^a): not in Weigand.

REZEPTMEISTER, m.: welches jederman wild Salbei teütschet, vnd die weysen Receptmeyster Eupatorium nennen (I, 3^b): not in *DWb*.

REZEPTSCHREIBER, m.: Dann dise Receptschreiber lernen jr höchste kunst von den Ammen (I, 3^b): not in *DWb*.

RIEDKRAUT, n.: da vil fisch weiher sind . . . wechßet vil Ror vnd Riedkraut (II, 28^b): *DWb* cites Nemnich.

RIPPECHT, adj.: Gemelte kuchen kreütter gewinnen im zweyten

jar der vffwachsung, jre rippechte stengel (II, 39^b): *DWb* cites Tabernaemontanus.

RODBOSCH, m.: Bathonien kreütter wachsen bedē in den finstern dicken rot büschen, in den dälern (I, 52^a); an rechen vnd wälden wechst, sunderlich aber in den Rotböschē, da dz erdtrich zūm theyl sandicht ist (149^a); welche yetzgesetzte blūmen fint man in welden vnn̄d rot boschen (170^b); In den dicken rot böschē da die Haselstauden wachsen, fint man gemeynlich die walt lälgen vmb die beum gewickelt (II, 71^a): not in *DWb*. The first component is *Rod*, 'durch roden gewonnenes land' (*DWb* VIII, 1106); the second part is *Busch*.

ROGGENHALM, m.: stoßt die wurtzel jre dolden oder Spargen, darauß werden runde stengel, als rocken helmer (I, 116^b): not in *DWb*.

ROHRGESWÄCHS, n.: komen wir zum rechten scharpffen Rorgewächs . . . vnder welchen sol ein Ror geschlecht vff wachsen in India (II, 28^b): not in *DWb*, which cites *Rohrgeschlecht* from Tabernaemontanus.

RUCKMEIßEL, m.: Eyn selblin mit Bertram vnd Chamillen oley gemacht, den ruckmeyssel darmit gesalbet, vnd warm zū gedeckt (I, 136^a): *DWb* cites Ryff (1559).

RUMETZ, RUMEX, f.: die zam Rumetz ist die obgenant zam Menwelwurtz, vnd die wild ist Sawrampfer . . . Die ander wild Rumex, Grindtwurtz, Zitterßwurtz, Menwelwurtz, wilder Ampffer, wilder Mangolt, Strippert, Strupff lattich, Buppen kraut, vnd bei etlichen spitze Letschen genant (I, 91^a); So wil ich nun dises Schlippen oder Schlangen wurtzel, vmb der gestalt vnd krafft willen, für das spitzig Rumex . . . halten (92^b): not in *DWb*.

RUNGELSE, f.: Mangolt kraut nent man an etlichen orten Römsche, vnd vber Rhein Rungelsen, vnd Romische köll, zū latein Beta hortensis (II, 39^b): under *Runkelrübe*, *DWb* (VIII, 1520) cites: "mangolt, an etlichen orten römischer kohl und *rungelsen*, heißt lateinisch beta. Tabernaemontanus 815." The borrowing from Bock is evident.

SALATKRESZ, m.: Nemlich, der Sallat Creß, der Brun Creß, vnd der wisen Creß. Der Garten Creß ist jederman bekant (I, 20^b): not in *DWb*.

SALSAMENT, n.: Würt jinnerlich in den salsamenten, vnd eusserlich pflasters weiß genommen (I, 22^b); Meerrhetich Kleyn zerschnitten, zerstoßen, mit saltz vnnnd essig abbereyt, gibt eyne gut salsament, mit fisch vnd fleysch, das wissen die Apicij fast wol (II, 47^a); würt alleyn zů den salsamenten oder sassen gebraucht, mit essig abbereyt (49^a): *DWb* cites Jacobsson (1781).

SAUERAMPFERLEIN, n.: Das kleyn Sawrampfferlin hieß wol Lapaciolum (I, 91^a): not in *DWb*.

SCELLENBLUME, f.: dringen die gelen runden Schellen blumen mitten herausser, gleich wie droben von den weissen Hornungs blumen gemelt ist (II, 53^b); Das kleyn Wind oder Glockenkraut, ist dem grossen mit . . . blettern, vnnnd Schellen blumen gleich (66^a): not in *DWb*.

SCHELLICHT, adj.: Neben den Klee blettern dringen die weisse schellichte violen herfür eyne yedes blümlin auch sunderlich auff seinem stilche (I, 154^b): *DWb* cites Tabernaemontanus (1664).

SCHLEPPSACK, m.: Solche kunst haben etlich Schlopseck gelernt, bringen sich selbs lieber in kranckheyt, dann das sie eyne weltlichen spot halten (I, 120^b): cf. *DWb* under *Schleppsack*, where various 16th century authors are cited, and *Schlappsack*, where a text of 1579 is given.

SCHLIPPENWURZEL, f.: So wil ich nun dises Schlippen oder Schlangen wurzel, vmb der gestalt vnd krafft willen, für das spitzig Rumex . . . halten (I, 92^b): *DWb* cites Nemnich.

SCHMECKBRÄTLEIN, n.: das haben die Apicianische leckspis vnd geneschige schmeckbrätlin, die stets in der kuchen stecken, erfunden (II, 51^a): not in *DWb*, which cites *Schmeckbraten* from Hermes (1776). Here the word is applied to a person who smells, or tastes, the roast in the kitchen.

SCHUSTERSCHWÄRZE, f.: Item so ist Chalcantum Schusterschwartz Dios. lib. 5. cap. 68. (I, 36^a): not in *DWb* as a plant name.

SCHWERTBLATT, n.: gegen dem Meyen wann die Schwertbletter gewachsen sind, dringen die runde stengel mit jren langen spitzigen blumen knöpfen, mitten durch die Schwertbletter (II, 37^a): not in *DWb*.

SEIDE, f.: War wollen wir mit dem verworren Filtz hin, das

vnserer weiber Seiden vnd Todtern nennen? (II, 67^b): *DWb* cites Nemnich.

SEIDENGEWÄCHS, n.: Es ist aber solch Seiden gewechs nichts anderst dann eyne verwirt garn mit vilen fäden (II, 67^a): not in *DWb*.

SEIDENKRAUT, n.: Es kan aber gedacht Seiden kraut nicht wol Orobanchen Diosco. sein . . . drum ichs für sein schwester halten muß, hab auch solch Seiden kraut für Epithymo gebraucht (II, 67^b): not in *DWb*.

SERIGKEIT, f.: eyne heylsam artzney zů dem munde wee, dann es heylet das essen, vnnd alle serigkeyt des munde (II, 61^b): *DWb* under *serig* cites *Serigkeit* from Tabernaemontanus (1588).

SKALA, n.(?): andern hochgelertern vnd erfarnern eyne scalen zů gericht haben, nach welchem sie . . . haben mögen (I, [2^a]): Weigand dates the word in the 18th century.

STRATUM, n.: sollen die feigen in die grossen Wullen kreutter gelegt werden, ye eyne stratum auff das ander &c. bis das der korb oder gefäß gefüllt werdt (I, 60^b): not in Weigand.

SUPERSTITION, f.: S. Johans kraut vnnd gurtel, ist auch in die superstition vnnd zauberey kommen (I, 99^a); Aber die Christen achten solcher superstition vnnd gauckelwerck nichts, wiewol vnder den selben nach vil superstition geduldet werden (112^b); ist meins bedunckens eyne rechte superstition auß Theophrasto in den Dioscoriden gesetzt worden (118^b): not in Weigand.

TAUSCHE: thůn sich die junge setzling bald vff, werden zů tauschen, vnnd zů letst zů weissen heůpter, wann sie wetters halben nit verkůrtzt werden. Solch weiß kraut pflegt man zů kochen (II, 42^a); Das erst vnd aller grőst wůrt etwan mit seinem braunen stengel manß hoch, erfreůrt selten im winter, dregt breyte blofarbe bletter, grősser dann keyne Cappes kraut, gewint keyne haupt pleiben alzeit tauschen, blůen im andern jar gleich wie der Cappes, ist am geschmack etwas bitter (43^a): not in *DWb*. The etymology of *Tausche* is not easy. Quite near the passages cited, Bock twice uses the noun *Durs* in describing a kind of cabbage:

der Cappes der aller gemeynest kost ist, vnnd wol settigt, das vberig theyl, als Cappes bletter vnd dursen von diesem kraut its auch onuerloren, gibt dem rindt vihe gůte mastung (I, 41^b); hab

ich nach dem winter wann der Cappes abgehawen vnnd jngethon, innwendig den vberblibenen Cappes dursen vnnd stimmelen imm marck, gütten zeittigen volkomelichen Cappes somen funden (42^a). This word appears in *DWb* as *Dorse*, *Dorsche*, and is traced back to Latin *thyrsus*, Greek *θύρσος*, 'Stengel eines Gewächses, der Strunk, Dorsch.' Fischer, *Schwäb. Wbch* II, 283, under *Dors^e*, *Dorsch^e*, gives among others this instance: 'Zu grossem TAUSchen oder Gschidel,' with the AU in heavy face type. There is no further explanation of the form, nor does *Tausche* appear in its alphabetical place in the dictionary. It would seem as if Fischer regarded it as a misprint, but the two instances in Bock invalidate this hypothesis. *Gschidel* is defined in the *Schwäb. Wbch* (III, 466) as 'Abfälle von Gemüse . . . missratene Kohl- Krautpflanze, die keinen Kopf gebildet hat.'

TERPENTIN: Der geruch aber freüntlich, beynahe wie Terpentein vnd Camillen (I, 20^a); gesotten, bis der safft . . . verzert ist, darnach terpentin darunder gerüret (63^b); Etlich nemen darzü feigen, dauben mist, honig, terpentur, oder baumöl mit eynander gesotten (II, 18^a): Weigand cites Mathesius (1562). The spelling *terpentur* is presumably a misprint.

TRANSFERIREN: möchte sein die Arabes hetten Griechisch nit wol verstanden, oder weren nit gründtlich transferiert (I, 80^b): not in Weigand.

TRANSLATION, f.: es sint aber die aller gelerteste menner . . . mit der Translation Acanthi auch noch nit eyns (II, 82^a): not in Weigand.

WALSTATT, f.: andere wurtzeln. Solche art hat der zam Rhetich nit, dann wo die selbige eyn mal auß jrer walstatt bewegt, wollen sie nimmer fürst wachsen (II, 47^a). The *DWb* (XIII, 1360 ff.) records various meanings of the word, 'schlachtfeld, kampfplatz, richtstätte, ort eines vorgangs, ort, wo ein bau aufgeführt werden soll, ort, wo holz geschlagen ist,' but not 'Ort, wo eine Pflanze aufwächst.'

ZITRINAT: je süsser der geruch würt, wie die Citrinaten riechen (I, 3^a); die fremde vnnd thewre sallat der bletter Oliuen, der versaltzenen Cappern, der gebeysten Citrinaten, vnnd gleiche ingemachte frembde kost (II, 42^a): Weigand cites *Citronat* (1548).

ZITRULLE: vom breyten somen, der sich den Citrullen körnern etlichermaß vergleicht (II, 72^b); Von Melonen, Pfedem, Cucumer, vnd Citrullen (73^a); wie die bletter an der Brionien, mit vilen schnitten oder kerfen zerspaltten, die selbige nent man Citrullen (73^b): not in Weigand.

W. KURRELMEYER

ON THE TWO MINOR POEMS IN THE HROTSVITHA CODEX

In the Emmeram codex of Hrotsvitha's works, now in Munich, there are two shorter poems, forming an appendix to the second of the three sections, the dramas. They are found on folios 129 *verso* and 130 *recto* and *verso*. The first consists of four elegiac distichs introduced by six words in prose, and the second is a thirty-five line piece in leonine hexameters. The early editors of Hrotsvitha—Celtès (1501), Schurzfleisch (1707), and Migne (1853)—simply ignored these two works. They were noticed and published for the first time by J. Bendixen in his pocket edition of the dramas: *Hrotsvithae . . . Comoedias sex ad fidem codicis emmeranensis typis expressas edidit, praefationem poetriae et ejus epistolam ad quosdam sapientes hujus libri fautores praemisit, versiculos quosdam Hrotsvithae nondum antea editos eodem ex codice eis adjunxit*.¹ In the following year K. A. Barack, in his edition, *Die Werke der Hrotsvitha*, again published them, erroneously claiming that he was doing so for the first time.² But neither Bendixen nor Barack could supply any information whatever on their significance.

It was not until 1902 that Paul von Winterfeld, in his edition of the works, *Hrotsvithae Opera recensuit et emendavit*, cleared up the problem.³ He showed that the first poem (in distichs) is not by Hrotsvitha at all, but constitutes a quotation from Bede's Church History which was probably inscribed upon a wall in the convent of Gandersheim. I note that these four distichs contain three striking instances of synalepha, viz.:

¹ Lübeck, 1857.

² Nürnberg, 1858, p. xv.

³ Berlin, Weidmann. See also K. Strecker in *Neue Jahrbücher für das klassische Altertum*, XI (1903), 632, note 2.

line 6: *Sponsa hymno exultans et nova dulcisono.*

line 8: *Quam affectu tulerat nullus ab altithrono.*

If there were any further doubt that these lines are not by Hrotsvitha, these three cases of synalepha occurring within three consecutive lines of text would probably be enough to exclude the possibility of Hrotsvitha's authorship. For, as I have shown elsewhere,⁴ Hrotsvitha studiously avoids synalepha, and it may well be that there is not a single genuine instance of it in the entire corpus of her writings. Indeed, when there is a choice she seems to prefer hiatus to synalepha. In the article just referred to I have suggested one such case. Another is in the dedicatory lines to Gerberg prefacing the *Legends*:

line 4: *Quae tibi purganda offero carminula.*

It should be noted that this harsh hiatus probably has a special purpose, viz. to mark more clearly the leonine "rime" *purganda-carminula*. Hrotsvitha is interested primarily in rime, not only in her verse, but also in her prose.⁵

As for the second of these short pieces, in thirty-five hexameters, it is now generally agreed to be an authentic work of Hrotsvitha. It consists of twelve separate parts; von Winterfeld states that it constitutes a description of eighteen pictures illustrating scenes from the book of Revelation. The verses, showing clear signs of Hrotsvitha's authorship,⁶ probably were inscribed under twelve

⁴ E. H. Zeydel, "A Note on Hrotsvitha's Aversion to Synalepha," in *Philological Quarterly*, XXIII, 4, October, 1944, 379 ff.

⁵ See K. Polheim, *Die lateinische Reimprosa*, Berlin, 1925, p. 6.

⁶ For example, 1. the use of characteristic favorite words and expressions, such as *nitidus* (occurring three times in this work: ll. 2, 15, 24, and often in her other writings), *praefulsere* (l. 4), *potis est* (instead of *potest*—l. 7), *micantes* (l. 15), and *rutilantis* (l. 16); 2. the frequent use of diminutives, such as *signacula* (l. 9—used only in this place by Hrotsvitha), *candidulus* (l. 18), and *tenellum* (l. 25—this otherwise rare word occurs twenty-one times in Hrotsvitha); 3. the use of the rare noun *incensum* (l. 22—also three times in the *Legend Maria*); 4. the use of *testis* in the sense of "martyr" (l. 14—thus used twenty times by Hrotsvitha); 5. the odd, but in Hrotsvitha regular, use of distributive in place of cardinal numerals: *bis duodenorum* (l. 3), and *bis senum* (l. 24); 6. the frequent shift from present to preterite tense; and 7. the avoidance of synalepha. The statistics on the use of words in other works are based upon E. M. Newnan, *The Latinity of the Works of Hrotsvit of Gandersheim*, University of Chicago dissertation, 1929.

murals in Gandersheim. Since to my knowledge they have never been translated into any modern language,⁷ I give a literal English rendering. My translation is based upon the text of Strecker's second edition (Teubner, 1930). The Roman numerals at the left mark the murals, while the references at the right refer to the book of Revelation.

I	John in his purity saw the heavens opened	4, 1
	And the Father of things seated on the gleaming throne,	4, 2
	Surrounded by a fair array of twice twelve elders	4, 4
	Who shone forth with beaming crowns,	
	All clothed in raiment of beaming white.	
	He also saw in the right hand of the king that sat on the throne	5, 1
	A book, the secret of which no man can discern.	
	The angel, seeking a worthy man, finds no one	5, 2. 3
	Who can open the seals of the closed book.	
II	He consoles John, who is weeping,	5, 4. 5
	By summoning a lamb that can loose the seals.	
III	Lo, the secrets of the book are opened by the lamb that had been slain;	5, 6. 7
	Soon the heavenly dwellers kneel and sing its praises.	5, 8. 9
IV	Behold the martyrs, crying with a loud voice at the altar,	6, 9. 10
	Receive robes glittering with shining whiteness.	6, 11
V	An angel, coming from the ruddy sunrise,	7, 2
	Seals the servants of the eternal King in their foreheads	7, 3
VI	After this he beheld a multitude in white standing	7, 9
	Praising the lamb and bearing palms in their hands.	
VII	Lo, the dwellers of heaven are silent about half an hour.	8, 1
VIII	An angel stood at the sacred altar with a censer	8, 3
	And bore incense, offering it with the holy prayers of the devout.	
IX	Lo, a woman beams, surrounded by beautiful sunlight,	12, 1
	Dight with a gleaming crown of twice six stars.	
	A serpent wishes to devour her tender child;	12, 3. 4
	But the dragon is destroyed and the child caught up unto the Lord,	12, 5
	And the dragon has fallen from heaven and is cast into the earth.	12, 9
X	Here behold the lamb standing on the mount Zion	14, 1
	And the host of virgins chanting new hymns.	14, 4. 3

⁷ Helene Homeyer's German version of them in *Roswitha von Gandersheim, Werke* (Paderborn, 1936), p. 257, is a mere abbreviated paraphrase.

- | | | |
|-----|---|---------------|
| XI | This beast attacks the saints with the power of a dragon. | 13, 1, 2, 7 * |
| | Truth coming forth on a white horse laid it low; | 19, 11, 19 |
| | He lashes the old dragon to fierce Tartarus. | 19, 20 |
| XII | Lo, the books of life are held open to the dead, | 20, 12 |
| | And quickened they arise who had been shackled by death. | 20, 13 |
| | Presently all are given their rewards according to their works. | |

The two minor poems which have been discussed here should not be confused with the puzzling eight lines of Old Glagolitic which appear on the back of the very last sheet of the codex (folio 150 verso), under the last fifteen lines of the *Gesta Oddonis*. Attention was called to them by Karl Bartsch in Pfeiffer's *Germania*.⁹ There is nothing about them to lead us to ascribe them to Hrotsvitha. But they seem to make it more certain that the codex was written in the tenth or eleventh century. It is baffling, though, how anything written in the Glagolitic alphabet, which was in vogue in Bulgaria and Croatia during the tenth century, got into a codex emanating from Gandersheim. Did the convent harbor a nun from the Balkans, as it once acted as host to an emissary from Spain who told the nuns of the martyrdom of Pelagius?¹⁰

EDWIN H. ZEYDEL

University of Cincinnati

* I correct Strecker's reference here.

⁹ xv, 1870, p. 194.

¹⁰ This article was awaiting publication when "The Works of Hrotsvitha" by Zoltán Haraszti appeared in *More Books. The Bulletin of the Boston Public Library*, xx, 3, 87-119, and 4, 139-173. Haraszti once more opens the whole question of authenticity first broached by Aschbach in 1867. He rightly feels that the Hrotsvitha manuscripts should be subjected to intensive examination by photo-chemical processes and modern paleography. But the conclusions which suggest themselves after reading Haraszti's article, viz. that not only the Emmeram-Munich codex and the *Primordia*, but also the recent manuscript discoveries of von Winterfeld, Frenken, and Menhardt may all be part of a colossal series of forgeries, frauds, and hoaxes cannot be accepted at present.

CHAUCER'S "GLORIOUS LEGENDE"

One of the peculiarities of Chaucer's *Legend of Good Women* which has received little emphasis is the paradox that the God of Love is to be honored not only by the praise of women who were faithful in love but also by the exposure of men who were false in love. This paradox is first hinted in lines 301 ff. of the G-text (not in F). After this Alceste pleads various excuses for the poet's having translated the *Roman de la Rose* and written the *Troilus*—these are the two specific charges against him—and in thanking her the poet pleads ignorance (F 462 ff., G 452 ff.). An honest man need not share in thieves' work, he says cryptically, and a true lover ought not to blame me for censuring false lovers; I merely followed "myn auctor" in both poems and my intention was "to forthren trouthe in love" and by example warn against wrongdoing. To which Alceste replies that the God does not like to be argued with and that for penance the poet shall devote the better part of his remaining years in composing a glorious legendary of faithful women and false men—

And telle of false men that hem bytraien,
That al hir lyf ne do nat but assayen
How many women they may doon a shame;
For in youre world that is now holde a game.

F 486-89, G 476-79)

Perhaps the clue to the mystery is in this last line only. But if the poet's sole offense was the translation of the *Roman de la Rose* and the writing of the *Troilus*, the penalty does not altogether fit the crime. Since the extant ME of *RR* is not certainly Chaucer's we must suppose for the sake of the argument that he did at least translate parts of the *Roman* which were unfavorable to women. The *Troilus* is more difficult to account for, since obviously Chaucer could sustain his contention that the story of Criseyde and her unhappy end was a warning to unfaithful women, and a fortiori he could insist that *Troilus* was a paragon of fidelity, a notable honor in the worship of Love. Is this a non sequitur or something rather subtle? or is it just humorous exaggeration?

If Chaucer wrote *LGW* as a deliberate palinode to the *Troilus*

and even, as has been suggested, as a reply to mistaken criticism, he must have written it with his tongue in his cheek. If any readers were so careless as to take his sympathy with Criseyde's weakness as an apology for feminine inconstancy, overlooking the artistic impasse into which the data of his story had led him, Chaucer's best answer was a mock palinode; and that seems to be what he gave them. He merely reversed the positions and gave them, with a smile, faithless men and faithful women.

But this is not all. He was commanded to begin with Cleopatra. This seems odd to us, of course, accustomed as we are to the romantic queen of tragedy. Yet if it is unnecessary to warn some of us against the snares of modernizing, it is necessary to urge others to take Chaucer at his own valuations, to read the stories as he wrote them, not as we know them.

Chaucer represents Antonius as one to whom "Fortune oughte a shame" after the prosperity upon which he had fallen; he finds no reason to condemn Antonius as a false lover, and he is content at the end to ask, with a jest, if any man was ever as true as Cleopataras—

Now, or I fynde a man thus trewe and stable,
And wol for love his deth so frely take,
I preye God let oure hedes nevere ake!

The next case, that of Piramus and Tysbe, is a simple one. Chaucer adds to his source a mild reproof of women who trust men they do not know very well (799-801) and has to admit that Piramus was "trewe"; his greatest fault (and Chaucer hardly emphasizes it) was to be unpunctual without excuse.

The case of Eneas is more complex: it is not clear whether he married Dido or not, but he was guilty of desertion certainly; yet he had a good excuse, and Chaucer remembering what Vergil had made of him lets him off lightly. And anyway, he says, women are innocent and trusting and blind to masculine weakness (1254 ff.).

At Jason, however, he explodes violently. "Have at thee, Jason," he cries, "Thow rote of false lovers"; and we, remembering Chaucer's comic use of pompous rhetoric elsewhere, have difficulty in taking the explosion seriously. It is a pity indeed, as he says, that false lovers have a better time than the rest—or so it seems: "For ever as tendre a capoun et the fox." Ysipele (after a long introduction combining Guido and Ovid) shows herself hospitable

to the shipwrecked Jason and Ercules, and is at first more taken with the latter (1520 ff.) ; but Ercules passes her on to the coy Jason (praising him outrageously, thus making himself *particeps criminis*). Chaucer declines to rime about the wooing: he says gaily: If there are any false lovers in the audience, they know how it went (1554 ff.) ; and he finishes off the story thus: Jason married the queen, took what he wanted of her money, begot two children on her, hoisted sail, and never saw her again (all in less than five lines). Medea is, like Antonius, a victim of Fortune (1609-10) ; she decides ("It is my wille, quod she") to help Jason win the Fleece; and after his adventure returns to Thessaly with him, where he abandons her and their two children. (The first statement of his desertion is put in a subordinate clause; l. 1655). This was her reward, says Chaucer, for loving and aiding Jason; but he had already indicated that Fortune was the prime mover and shown that Medea made the first overtures. Jason, bad as he was, was in these two affairs more pursued than sinning.

The legend of Lucesse is of another sort: both she and Philomene are not martyrs of love but victims of lust. Tarquinius is both re-proved and punished, but Chaucer's emphasis is on the modesty and suffering of Lucesse. Terous, on the other hand, gets off easily: he merely loses his name. Chaucer lavishes but one exclamation on him ("Lo! here a dede of men, and that a ryght!") and ends with a mock-serious fillip: Let women beware of men, if they will, for there is little faith in them though they may not all be murderers and knaves:

That wol I seyn, al were he now my brother—
But it be so that he may have non other.

Adriane and Phedra belong to the Ysiphele and Medea type. Their tale is introduced by the story of Mynos, who was himself a false lover; but to keep the accounts parallel Chaucer shows that "Nysus doughter" made love to him first. Similarly Theseus in distress is approached by the Cretan sisters. Adriane proposes that they help him with the Mynotaur (1977 ff.) ; Phedra works out a plan of action (1985 ff.) ; Theseus humbly accepts and swears to serve them as their page. But Adriane answers boldly: 'You, a king's son! that would be a shame. *Yit were it betere that I were youre wyf, and your son [who was apparently still unborn] can marry Phedra here.*' Theseus swears another oath and, entering into the spirit of

the thing, protests that he has been in love with her, sight unseen, these seven years. Whereupon Adriane whispers to Phedra: Now we are both duchesses and likely to be queens of Athens (2126 ff.). Yet it was not to be; for Theseus abandons her on the island and proceeds homeward with the more beautiful sister (and more accomplished, for she planned his successful encounter with the Mynotaur). "A twenty devel-wey the wynd hym dryve!" exclaims Chaucer: "These false lovers, poyson be here bane!" It seems that Chaucer has made a mock of poor little Ariadne; her story is put in a framework of levity. It begins with the assault on Mynos ("Be red for shame") and ends

But thus this false love can begyle
His trewe love, the devel quyte hym his while!

The legend of Phillis opens with a flourish against Demophon like that against Jason his father, only milder; but Chaucer in his eighth story is already tired: "I am agroted herebyforn To wryte of hem that ben in love forsworn" (2454 f.). Phillis for variety's sake shows a little spirit and expresses some indignation before committing suicide. The end is flippant again—

Be war, ye wemen, of youre subtyl fo, . . .
And trusteth, as in love, no man but me.

But he no longer trusted himself, and with Ypermystre gave it up. Both she and her husband had a bad background and the Wirdes were hostile from the start; and though there is no doubt that she was a good wife and Lyno was not a good husband . . . *caetera desunt*.

The tales which Chaucer selected for his Glorious Legendary were thus of three types. His first two pairs of lovers, Antony and Cleopatra, Pirus and Thisbe, are evenly matched, the women are true lovers and so also are the men. But so far Chaucer has not kept the faith, since his program called for masculine delinquents. For the third pair, although Aeneas betrayed Dido, his case has to be dismissed on a technicality: he had a higher mission than love of woman. On the other hand, Tarquin, Tereus, and Lynceus are unmistakable villains, but their partners are not romantic lovers and not really worshippers of the God; each was faithful in her fashion, but not quite in accordance with the premises of the Prologue. There remain five other pairs, the

fourth, fifth, seventh, eighth, and tenth in order of their appearance: three of these are distinct and alike, Hypsipile and Jason, Medea and Jason, Ariadne and Theseus; the other two (Scylla and Minos, Phyllis and Demophon) are but pale replicas, by Chaucer's own accounting, of Ariadne and Theseus. Now these five, out of the total eleven, have a special characteristic: whereas the men are certainly faithless and the women are certainly faithful, the women are also somewhat forward, they immolate themselves, and in the language of the vulgar they ask for it. And this, be it noted, is no modern interpretation but in accord with Chaucer's rendering of their stories. Ariadne (whom the poets before and since have treated sympathetically) is the most notable offender because her eye was so obviously on the main chance. These women, as Chaucer has represented them, would not in all justice be welcome back in the Prologue. They loved, but not wisely. In spite of their fidelity they profane the shrine: they actually wooed the infidelity of men. It is necessary to ask, therefore, if Chaucer was oblivious of this discrepancy in the execution of his penitential program. After all proper discount is made for the danger of not being mediæval enough in our approach to the question, is it reasonable to suppose that Chaucer did not know what he was doing, or perhaps one should say, did not recognize where his path was leading? The terms of his commission were to honor true women and expose false men; he soon broke down and admitted that he was bored—worse, he was *agroted*—with the latter. And the men he chose to inveigh against most vigorously, Jason, Minos, and Theseus, were all entangled with women who had forced themselves on their attention, women who were so accessible that they invited trouble. One need not believe that Chaucer put the matter to himself quite like this, but something told him that his program had gone wrong. He felt that Alcestis would not be happy over the turn of events, he saw clearly enough that he was not getting on. He understood that women are not really extolled or their virtues enhanced by exposing the wickedness of men: and if his pretended penance was actively and emphatically to defame men as lovers under the guise of praising the constancy of women, he found himself in a small labyrinth to which we have no clue. There may be some topical or contemporary satire which we miss; or it may be humorous perverseness.

PAULL F. BAUM

Duke University.

A NOTE ON CHAUCER'S MOTHER

In the Prefatory Note of his dissertation, *Chaucerian Problems: Especially the Petherton Forestership and the Question of Thomas Chaucer* (Lancaster, 1932), Mr. Russell Krauss mentions "Eric St. John Brook's (sic) gratifying discovery from the Cartulary of the Priory of the Holy Trinity, Aldgate, that Agnes Chaucer was the daughter of Hamo de Copton's brother James (*New England Genealogical and Historical Register*, October, 1929)."¹ Professor F. N. Robinson, whose edition of the complete works of Chaucer was published in 1933, includes this statement in his biography of the poet: "His father was John Chaucer and his mother probably Agnes, mentioned as John Chaucer's wife in 1349. She is described in the same document as a relative and heir of Hamo de Copton, and is to be identified, on the evidence of a recently discovered cartulary of Holy Trinity, Aldgate, with his niece Agnes, daughter of James de Copton."²

Mr. E. St. John Brooks first called attention to his discovery in a letter to the *London Times* of March 14, 1929. Here he quotes a record found in the cartulary of the Priory of Holy Trinity, Aldgate, London, stating that "Hamo de Copton died without heirs of his body, and that his heir was his kinswoman (*consanguinea*) Agnes, daughter of John, his brother; and that Agnes married one John Chaucer."³ Mr. Brooks expanded this article considerably for the *New England Genealogical and Historical Register*, October, 1929; but the fact stated is exactly the same: that Hamo's heir "was Agnes, his kinswoman (*consanguinea*), being daughter of John, Hamo's brother."⁴

Later, Mr. Brooks summarizes: "The evidence of the cartulary, therefore, is that Agnes Chaucer was the daughter of John de Copton, a brother of Hamo de Copton."⁵ Nowhere is there mention of a James de Copton.

It is worthy of note that Mr. G. K. Chesterton gives the correct name in his biography of the poet. Perhaps basing his statement on the original notice in the *Times*, but without mentioning the

¹ P. 3.² P. xv.³ *London Times Literary Supplement*, March 14, 1929. P. 207.⁴ P. 392.⁵ P. 393.

source, Mr. Chesterton simply states: "John married Agnes, daughter of John Copton, of a family connected with the Mint, and lived in Thames Street."⁶

NAN COOKE CARPENTER

New Haven, Conn.

FALSTAFF AND THE ART OF DYING

Recently a scholar has suggested that Shakespeare was burlesquing the death of Socrates in his account of Falstaff's demise.¹ I doubt if we need to turn to a classical model for this picture when the clue to the irony and pathos of this scene may be found in the literature and in the conventions of conduct of Elizabethan England. The death of Falstaff, as the Hostess recounts it, is a satirical picture of the conventional deathbed scene in Shakespeare's day as it was outlined in the popular how-to-die literature. The satirical touches of this account would not escape an audience well aware of the proper directions for making a good exist from this world.

In order that a satire may be successful, it must be immediately recognized by the audience. The success of the satire in such comedies as *I'd Rather Be Right* or *Both Your House* depended on the audience's familiarity with the contemporary political situation and the conventions of congressional politics. Just so, the Elizabethan, being, as he was, aware of the conventional ritual attendant on a proper deathbed and a good end, would find in the record of Falstaff's death an appropriateness and a humorous touch which might be lost on a present-day audience for most of whom the business of dying has no longer a set ritual.

The formal directions for the art of dying go back to the *Ars Moriendi* of the fifteenth century. An examination of the various

⁶ Chesterton, *Chaucer*. London, 1932. P. 84.

¹ John R. Moore, *The Explicator*, Vol. I, June 1943, No. 61 and Monroe Stearn's reply in *The Explicator*, Vol. II, December 1943, No. 19. The descriptions of the signs of death may be found in Holland's translation of Pliny and in such books as Simon Kellwaye's, *A Defensitive Against the Plague*. London: 1593, p. 16. See also the notes on the passage in *The Life of King Henry Fifth*. Arden Shakespeare. Ed. H. A. Evans.

texts and versions of the *Ars* establishes a simple pattern of directions which can be described as follows:

Part I. This is an introduction which treats of the nature of death which men should face gladly and courageously.

Part II. A description of the five temptations which assail man at the final hour: disbelief, despair, impatience with suffering, spiritual pride and avarice which is the temptation of temporal things.

Part III. The interrogations. Questions on the profession of faith and a confession of sin.

Part IV. This section deals with rules of conduct: make a will, make confession, take the sacrament, say certain prayers, and at the last say, "Lord into thy hands, etc. . . ." or make some appropriate sign.

Parts V and VI contain instructions for friends, warnings about giving bodily aid precedence over spiritual aid, prayers to say to console *Moriens* and others to say after his death.³

This pattern was altered somewhat by the Protestant writers of the Post-Reformation period. Often violently anti-papist in tone, they omitted the interrogations or introduced variations of them, they added many prayers and scriptural passages, stressed the making of the will, and devoted much space to the questions of predestination, justification by faith, suicide, and the validity of deathbed repentances. The important points, however, remain the same, and this literature on holy dying became increasingly popular with humble folk who believed that the proper exit from this world might be the "open sesame" to eternal life. All agreed on the necessity for making a good end.³

One of the most popular books on holy dying was Becon's, *The Sicke Mannes Salve*.⁴ Here, by means of a realistic dialogue between the dying man, Epaphroditus, and his friends, the author presents a model of a Christian's death. By comparing a brief résumé of this book with the pattern of the medieval *Ars* literature, we can see how closely even this strongly Puritan account follows the old rules.

³ Sister Mary Catherine O'Connor. *The Art of Dying Well*. (Columbia University Studies in English and Comparative Literature, No. 56. New York: Columbia University Press, 1942), pp. 24 ff.

⁴ William Perkins, *A Salve for a Sick Man*. London, 1595, p. 17. See *STC* for works of Becon, Hill, Sutton, Tuke, Verstegen, Vaughan, etc.

⁵ Thomas Becon, *The Sicke Mannes Salve*, 1563, went into seventeen editions by 1632.

I. Epaphroditus complains of illness, knows his end is near and calls his friends who urge him to consider the state of his soul. (*Ars* I)

II. They discuss his sins, urge his repentance and assure him of Christ's mercy. (*Ars*. III)

III. He makes a will. (*Ars* IV)

IV. He advises his wife and children. (*Ars* IV)

V. They discuss the fear of death, the temptations of this world and the final temptation to despair of God's mercy. (*Ars* II)

VI. He confesses his faith and dies, saying "Lord Jesus take my Spirite. O heavenly father. I commend my spirit into thy hands." (*Ars* IV)

VII. His friends make the proper prayers and arrange for the funeral. (*Ars* V and VI)

Many years have passed since an unknown priest wrote the *Ars Moriendi*, the *Crafte of Dyinge*, but this vigorously anti-papist writer of the sixteenth century shows how deeply the conventional pattern for a deathbed ritual had been stamped on the people. When a formula becomes so well known we can expect the Elizabethan to recognize a satire on it.

In contrast to this well established ritual for making a good end, let us consider the life and death of Falstaff. Much of Falstaff's humor lies in his use of Puritan catch phrases "with his mock apologies for his sins and his size with affectations of holiness and patter about repentance."⁵ In his life the staple of the jest was often the wide divergence between his pious speeches and his conduct, and in his death, the same method is used. This time, however, it is the Hostess who in her kindness guilelessly takes over the language of the devout and their model of conduct and tries to fit Falstaff to a conventional end—which is unconventional after all.

When Falstaff died at the turning of the tide, he cried out, "God, God" three or four times, spoke of sack and the whore of Babylon (was this his last Puritan pun?) and of the flea on Bardolph's nose which seemed a soul burning in hell. (Surely the Elizabethan recalled, even as we do, the scene in Part I where Bardolph's nose reminded Falstaff of hell-fire.) There were no long prayers though he called on God; no confession though he talked of sins. The vision of burning souls may have been the devil's temptation to despair.⁶ There was no making of a will.

⁵ J. Dover Wilson, *The Fortunes of Falstaff*. Oxford Press: 1944, p. 93. See also *Henry IV*, Part I, Act 1. 2; III, sc. 3; V, sc. 1. 1, Act II, Act II, sc. 4.

⁶ Becon, *op. cit.* Fol. CCLX verso. The devil casts a mist before the dying

There was no deathbed repentance whose validity the divines so warmly debated. Many have called upon God and died like lambs. The answer was stern: "Like lambes: why most of them die like stones. They live a sottish and senseless life and so they die."⁷ The Hostess would reassure us all, "Nay sure he's not in hell. He's in Arthur's bosom if ever man went to Arthur's bosom. 'A made a finer end and went away as it had been any christom child."⁸ In her defense she recognizes the importance of making a good end, but Abraham's bosom and Arthur's were one to her. Her kindly advice not to think of God because she hoped "there was no need to trouble himself with any such thoughts yet" was far from the consolation approved by the writers on holy dying, who warned that "sweet wordes and vain hopes often deceived the sicke: let them be comforted in the name of God, but in a discreet sort."⁹ Whether Falstaff burns in hell or rests in Abraham's bosom remains an unsolved problem in spite of the Hostess. Clearly the Elizabethan would have recognized in this "end" the deft satire on the conventional deathbed ritual.

It is not necessary to say that Shakespeare read the literature on holy dying. The amount written on this subject was so large that its general rules were part of every Christian's knowledge. No Elizabethan family could have escaped some contact with the conventional ritual of the deathbed, a ritual which, originally Catholic, had become in the sixteenth century a part of the Anglican and Puritan teaching. The art of dying was the art of arts, and it is safe to postulate that Shakespeare and all Elizabethans knew it by one means or another. And surely the Elizabethan audience would have recognized in the Hostess's report of Falstaff's death the satiric humor of this departure from the accepted deathbed ritual and the suitability of such an end for such a sinner.

KATHRINE KOLLER

The University of Rochester

man's eyes so that he sees "nothing but fearce wrath and terrible judgment of God against synners."

⁷ Robert Hill, *A Direction to Die Well*. London, 1610. Book 1, question 19.

⁸ *Henry V*, Act II, scene 3, ll. 9-12.

⁹ Christopher Sutton, *Disce Mori*, p. 276; Perkins, *op. cit.*, p. 78.

"A LIVING DROLLERY" (*TEMPEST*, III, iii, 21)

In Sebastian's description of the strange shapes who offer him and his comrades a banquet, "A living drollery" (*Tempest* III, iii, 21), the word *drollery* is usually explained as "puppet show." This definition, so far as I can learn, is due to Steevens, who annotated this passage with the statement that "Shows, called *drolleries*, were, in Shakespeare's time, performed by puppets only." It has been passed on by Nares, Dyce, and all the editors; indeed, only Schmidt seems to have felt doubts about it. It stands, I think, in need of closer examination.

Omitting several late seventeenth-century uses in which the word means "a jest" or "jesting," I find eight other early examples in the *NED*. and the commentaries, as follows:

Shakespeare, *2 Henry IV* (1598), II, i, 155 ff.: Glasses, glasses is the only drinking; and for thy walls, a pretty slight drollery, or the story of the Prodigal, or the German hunting in waterwork, is worth a thousand of these bed-hangers and these fly-bitten tapestries.

Dekker, *The Belman of London* (1606), ed. Grosart iii (1885), p. 87: The whole *Roome* shewed a farre off . . . like a dutch peece of *Drollery*: for they sate at table as if they had beene so many Anticks: A Painters prentice could not draw worse faces than they themselues made, besides those which God gaue them; no, nor a painter himselfe vary a picture into more strange and more ill-fauord gestures, than were to be seene in the Action of their bodies.

Dekker, *The Seven Deadly Sinnes of London* (1608), ed. Arber (1880), p. 1: And a *Drollerie* (or Dutch peece of *Lantskop*) may sometimes breed in the beholders eye, as much delectation, as the best and most curious master-peece excellent in that Art.

Jonson, *Bartholomew Fair* (1614), Ind., ed. Herford & Simpson vi (1938), pp. 16 f.: If there bee neuer a *Seruant-monster* i' the *Fayre*; who can helpe it? he sayes; nor a nest of *Antiques*? Hee is loth to make Nature afraid in his *Playes*, like those that beget *Tales*, *Tempests*, and such like *Drolleries*, to mixe his head with other mens heeles, let the concupisence of *Iigges* and *Dances*, raigne as strong as it will amongst you: yet if the *Puppets* will please any body, they shall be entreated to come in.

Fletcher, *Valentinian* (1614), ed. Glover & Waller iv (1906), p. 20:

Claud. Chimney pieces:

Now heaven have mercy upon me, and young men,

I had rather make a drallery till thirty,
 While I am able to endure a tempest,
 And bear my fights out bravely, till my tackle
 Whistl'd i'th'Wind, and held against all weathers,
 While I were able to bear with my tyres,
 And so discharge 'em, I would willingly
 Live, *Marcellina*, not till barnacles
 Bred in my sides.

Dekker & Massinger, *The Virgin Martyr* (1620), V, i, ed. Cunningham (1897), p. 29:

As a curious painter,
 When he has made some honourable piece,
 . . . hugs
 Himself for his rare workmanship—so here,
 Will I my drolleries, and bloody landscapes,
 Long past wrapt up, unfold, to make me merry.

Fletcher, *The Wild-goose Chase* (1621), I, ii, ed. Glover & Waller iv (1906), p. 320:

Our Women the best Linguists, they are Parrats;
 O' this side the *Alpes* they are nothing but meer Drolleries.

Evelyn, *Diary*, 13 August 1641, ed. Wheatley (1879), i, 18: We arrived late at Rotterdam, where was their annual marte or faire, so furnished with pictures (especially Landskips and Drolleries, as they call those clownish representations).

In the first three quotations, the sixth, and the last, the meaning of the word is obvious. It means a grotesque picture or other graphic representation. Precisely what kind of pictorial representation is intended may be uncertain and I suspect that several varieties may be comprehended in these examples, but the implication of a picture is patent. The word is apparently of French origin, and the earliest example known to me is found in the *Meslanges Historiques* of Pierre de Saint-Julien (Lyons, 1589). It is quite explicit:

Now (as if in disdain of class distinction, in scorn and mockery of the arms of gentlemen and other devices of honor) the painters, masons, goldsmiths, cabinetmakers, and such sorts of craftsmen, and especially those imbued with the new [Lutheran] opinions, and on that account enemies of lordly privilege, desiring to render all equal, indulged themselves in what they call drolleries; so that in order to show themselves less well furnished with choice inspirations than perfect imitators, they gave currency to a new kind of foolish emblems, letting it be known that, however skillful the hand of such drollists, at the same time they were wofully lacking in cleverness and even more in solidity of judgement.

Such being the case, we see that, wishing to represent the arms of some gentleman which they happen to be concerned with, if the arms had no device of their own, such as those of which we have spoken in this discourse and the preceding, they will emblazon (that is to say, at the top of the arms) either a mask or the picture of a face of a faun or satyr or some meaningless and ridiculous buffoonery, and (at the worst) a baboon gaping with open mouth.¹

Cotgrave's definition corresponds perfectly with this: "the figure of a Maske, Satire, Monkie, or such like apish visages, and antick resemblances, set on the top of a Scutcheon, or coat of Armes."² Baker describes Falstaff's "pretty slight drollery" as "the sort of fanciful design with groups of grotesque figures which more or less grew out of foliage, or sometimes animal forms."³ This description closely corresponds with the *NED.*'s account of the word *antic*, which was "used as equivalent to It[alian] *grottesco*, f[rom] *grotta*, 'a cauerne or hole vnder grounde' (Florio), app[arently] ad[apted from] It. *antico*, . . . orig[inally] applied to fantastic representations of human, animal, and floral forms, incongruously running into one another, found in exhuming some ancient remains (as the Baths of Titus) in Rome, whence extended to anything

¹ Pp. 575 f. "Or (cōme si c'estoit en desdain de la distinctiō des Estats, en mespris, & mocquerie des Tymbres des Gentils-hommes, & autres signals d'hōneur) les Peintres, Maçons, Orfeures, Menuysiers, & telles sortes d'ouuriers: & sur tous les imbuz des opinions nouuelles: & en ce nom ennemys de superioritez Seigneurialles, en desir de rendre tout esgal: se sont addonnez à ce qu'ils appellent drauleries: de façon que pour se montrer moins fourniz de belles inuētiōs, que doctes imitateurs: ils ont mis en vsage vne nouuelle maniere de signalz de sottise, faisant cognoistre que combien que la main de tels Draulistes soit docte, si y a il (au reste) en eux grandissime faute de bon esprit: & encores plus de solidité de iugement.

"Qu'ainsi soit, on veoid que voulants exprimer les armes de quelque Seigneur que l'occasion leur presente: si elles n'ont vn signal exprez, tel que ceux dont nous auons parlé en ce discours, & aux precedents: ils mettront en Tymbre, c'est à dire sur le haut des armes, ou vn masque, ou le portraict d'un visage de Faune, ou Satyre, ou quelque inepte, & ridicule babouynnerie: & (au pis aller) vn babouyn baillant à gueule ouuerte." I am very grateful to Professor G. O. Seiver for helping me to translate the French.

² *A dictionarie of the French and English tongues* (1632).

³ Oliver Baker, *In Shakespeare's Warwickshire, and the Unknown Years* (1937), p. 149.

similarly incongruous or bizarre." *Antic* itself also occurs in two of the passages quoted.

On the other hand, Staunton identifies Falstaff's drollery as "one of those scenes of coarse humour which the painters of the Dutch school introduced, between the end of the sixteenth, and the middle of the seventeenth century," and this agrees very well with the quotations from Dekker and Evelyn. But it may be that the heraldic humor described by Saint-Julien and the grotesque fancies of painters like Bosch and Breughel had enough in common to go by the same name.

The *NED.* puts the passages from *The Tempest*, *Bartholomew Fair*, and *The Wild-goose Chase* in a class by themselves to which it assigns the meaning of "puppet-show." I suggest, however, that in each of them the other meaning, a grotesque picture, is equally suitable and that there is no established connection between *drollery* and *puppet-show*. I suspect that Steevens's gloss was derived from the assumption that since *droll* means *puppet-show*, *drollery* must mean the same thing. If so, it puts the cart before the horse, for the first recorded use of *droll* is almost fifty years later than 2 *Henry IV*, which introduced *drollery*. And indeed the assumption that *droll* means puppet-show, though probable enough, is not easily substantiated. The *NED.* does not differentiate this meaning of *droll* from "a farce; an enacted piece of buffoonery," and of the examples which it collects only one (from Shaftesbury's *Characteristics*, 1711) mentions or hints at a puppet-show and then without making it clear whether the two things are equivalents or alternatives. Professor Elson, the editor of Kirkman's drolls, while he allows for the possibility that they were sometimes acted by puppets, finds no clear evidence to that effect.⁴ It may be suspected, I think, that the eighteenth-century scholars who first annotated Elizabethan plays for us did not understand that a stage-piece so elementary as a droll could be played by living actors and assumed that alternatively it must be a puppet-show. At all events, *droll* clearly is of little use in determining the meaning of *drollery* during the lifetime of Shakespeare, long before it was adopted as an English word.

⁴ *The Wits or, Sport upon Sport*, ed. J. J. Elson (Cornell Studies in English xviii, 1932).

Of the foregoing quotations,⁵ the only one that would give the slightest warrant for connecting drolleries and puppet-shows is that from *Bartholomew Fair*, but there the word *Puppets*, in an apology for the introduction of them in the play to follow, after so much scorn of base kinds of entertainment, does not seem to me to explain or to have any necessary connection with *Drolleries*. Rather puppet-shows seem to be excepted from the class to which drolleries belong. On the other hand, the allusion to *Antiques* and the announced aversion to making "Nature afraid" accord perfectly with the idea that a drollery is a representation of the grotesque or a grotesque representation of the natural.

In *The Tempest*, a "living drollery" might just as well mean an animated grotesque picture as an animated puppet-show. In view of the lack of clear indications that *drollery* was used as a name for a puppet-show, it seems to me much safer to understand it in a sense well established by contemporary usage.

M. A. SHABER

University of Pennsylvania

ROWLEY, FOXE, AND THE FAUSTUS ADDITIONS

The 1616 edition of Marlowe's *Doctor Faustus* contained a new scene, added by Samuel Rowley and William Bird, representing happenings in the Papal court at Rome.¹ Dr. Frederick Boas, who bases his recent edition of the play upon the 1616 impression, com-

⁵ I do not know whether I can explain the passage in *Valentinian* (Coleridge pronounced it corrupt), but I feel sure that it does not mean what Gifford says it means, "spend her youth in making puppet-shows, which she considers as the lowest scene of degradation." Marcellina has just asked Claudia whether she would wish to live to become like the emperor's bawds and the latter is emphatically voting for a short life but a merry. She scorns becoming a chimney-piece; she wishes to live only as long as she can hold her own in the duel of the sexes. She had rather make herself ridiculous till she is thirty and then die than live longer in obsolescence. At all events, it is clear that no connection between *drollery* and *puppet-show* can be predicated upon this passage.

¹ *The Tragical History of Doctor Faustus* (ed. Boas, London, 1932), III, i, 55 ff. and ii, 1-93. See also *Henslowe's Diary* (ed. Greg.), I, 172.

ments upon "the reckless disregard for historical truth," the "fictions of a Papal triumphant victory, and of a Saxon Bruno as a candidate for St. Peter's chair in the sixteenth century," that make up most of this scene. He adds:

It is noteworthy that alone among the 1616 additions these episodes are not drawn from the English *Faust Book*. They are so fantastic that we are tempted to look beneath the surface and to wonder, when the Pope announces (III, i, 128 f.):

We will depose the Emperor for that deed,
And curse the people that submit to him,

whether there is not a half-hidden reference to the Papal excommunication of Elizabeth.²

It is now possible to explain the elements that puzzled Boas by pointing to their source. That the lines he quotes were intended as a sidewise glance at the Papal bull against Elizabeth we need not doubt. Any audience of the time would so have taken them. But they have a more direct meaning also. Rowley, it can be demonstrated, employed John Foxe's *Acts and Monuments*—the so-called Book of Martyrs—as a source for one series of scenes in his *When You See Me You Know Me*.³ It is less surprising, then, to find that he went to the same source for his scene at the Papal court. According to Foxe,

[Pope] Adrian IV, an Englishman, by name called Breakspear, belonged once to St. Albans. This Adrian kept great stir, in like manner, with the citizens of Rome. . . . The like business and rage he also stirred up . . . against the empire, blustering and thundering against Frederick, the Emperor.⁴

Adrian finally excommunicated Frederick, and later died by choking on a fly.⁵ Foxe says of his successor,

² *Op. cit.*, p. 29.

³ See Foxe (ed. Pratt), v, 553-561, "The Story of Queen Katharine Parr," which describes a conspiracy to dislodge the Queen from the King's favor because of her "Lutheran" tendencies. Rowley used this story with only a minimum of changes to adapt it to the stage; all the scenes of the play concerned with the conspiracy, constituting about a fifth of the whole, are taken directly from Foxe. There are frequent easily recognized verbal echoes. *When You See Me You Know Me* (Tudor Facsimile edition), sig. H2-K3.

⁴ *Ibid.*, II, 189.

⁵ *Ibid.*, II, 195.

Yet came the next much worse, one Alexander III, who yet was not elected alone, for beside him the Emperor, with nine cardinals . . . did set up another pope, named Victor IV. Between these two popes arose a foul schism and great discord.⁶

Victor received the Emperor's support, but Alexander had many friends, and moving swiftly he consolidated his position. At Venice he was lucky enough to get the Emperor's son Otto into his clutches.

The father, to help the captivity and misery of his son, was compelled to submit himself to the Pope, and to entreat for peace; so the Emperor coming to Venice (at St. Mark's Church, where the bishop was, there to take his absolution), was bid to kneel down at the Pope's feet.

The proud Pope, setting his foot upon the Emperor's neck, said the verse of the psalm, "*Super aspidem et basiliscum ambulabis, et conculcabis leonem et draconem*;" that is, "Thou shalt walk upon the adder and on the basilisk, and shalt tread down the lion and the dragon." To whom the Emperor answering again, said, "Non tibi sed Petro;" that is, "Not to thee but to Peter." The Pope again, "Et mihi et Petro;" "Both to me and to Peter." The Emperor, fearing to give any occasion of further quarreling, held his peace, and so was absolved, and peace made between them.⁷

Let us now compare this episode from Foxe with Rowley's addition to *Faustus*:

- | | | |
|--------|--|---------|
| Pope. | Cast down our footstool. | |
| Ray. | Saxon Bruno, stoop, | |
| | Whilst on thy back his Holiness ascends | |
| | Saint Peter's chair and state pontifical. | |
| Bruno. | Proud Lucifer, that state belongs to me; | |
| | But thus I fall to Peter, not to thee. | |
| Pope. | To me and Peter shalt thou grovelling lie, | |
| | And crouch before the Papal dignity. | (89-96) |
| | | |
| Bruno. | Pope Adrian, let me have right of law, | |
| | I was elected by the Emperor. | |

⁶ *Ibid.*

⁷ *Ibid.*, II, 195 f. At this point in the ancient editions of Foxe stood one of the woodcuts that added so much to the effectiveness of the book. It showed Pope Alexander, in triple crown and accompanied by a bishop and a cardinal, placing his foot upon the neck of the prostrate Emperor Frederick. On a ribbon issuing from the Pope's mouth is the verse of the Psalms, "*Super aspidem*," etc. (91: 13); and on a separate scroll, in Latin, is the remainder of their dialogue as Foxe reports it. See Foxe (ed. 1583), sig. P6.

Pope. We will depose the Emperor for that deed,
 And curse the people that submit to him;
 Both he and thou shalt stand excommunicate,
 And interdict from Church's privilege
 And all society of holy men:
 He grows too proud in his authority,
 Lifting his lofty head above the clouds,
 And like a steeple over-peers the Church:
 But we'll pull down his haughty insolence.
 And as Pope Alexander, our progenitor,
 Trod on the neck of German Frederick,
 Adding this golden sentence to our praise—
 'That Peter's heirs should tread on Emperors,
 And walk upon the dreadful adder's back,
 Treading the lion and the dragon down,
 And fearless spurn the killing basilisk:'
 So will we quell that haughty schismatic:
 And by authority apostolical
 Depose him from his regal government. (126-146)

These lines are a loose reinterpretation of the Papal history as found in Foxe. Rowley has reversed the order of the two popes, changed Victor's name to Bruno and given him the Emperor's lines to speak, and taken other liberties with Foxe's story. But much of the substance remains.²

LESLIE M. OLIVER

Brookline, Mass.

SPENSER AND MILTON: AN EARLY ANALOGUE

Twenty years ago Hanford observed that "the time at which Milton first made the acquaintance of Spenser"¹ is uncertain. That Milton, who five decades later followed Spenser from London to Cambridge, must have acquired something more than a mild interest in the poetry of his predecessor at "reedy Cam" would

² For Foxe's source, see John Bale, *Acta Romanorum Pontificum* (Basle, 1538); it was translated into English later as *The Pageant of Popes* (London, 1574); see fol. 101. There seems to be little reason to believe that Rowley consulted anything but Foxe and his own imagination.

¹ J. H. Hanford, "The Youth of Milton," *Univ. of Michigan Publications, Language and Literature*, 1 (1925), 137.—I am indebted to my colleague Professor Harris Fletcher for several valuable suggestions.

seem, however, a reasonable assumption.² Yet not, perhaps, until Milton identified his own career and poetic idealism with Spenser's, did his "new allegiance"³ actually begin. As early as the Cambridge days when he was writing his Sixth Latin Elegy and the Italian sonnets—or very shortly thereafter—Milton's interest in Spenser may well have led him to look into the Latin verse-letter from Spenser to Gabriel Harvey which had been published by Bynnenman in 1580.⁴ That Milton was familiar with the Spenser-Harvey correspondence or with Spenser's Latin poem cannot, of course, be proved.

Toward the end of Spenser's poem occur the following lines:

Namque sinu pudet in patrio, tenebrisque pudendis,
Non nimis ingenio juvenem infoelice virentes
Officijs frustra deperdere vilibus annos,
Frugibus et vacuas speratis cernere spicas.⁵

The phrase *Non nimis ingenio juvenem infoelice*⁶ could hardly have failed to impress the young Milton with the similarity to his

² Hanford, *art. cit.*: "The *Faerie Queene* Milton must, one would suppose, have read before [the Horton period]." The probability, viewed with favor since Hanford's article appeared, that *Il Penseroso* was written before Horton would suggest evidence enough of Spenser's early influence on Milton.

³ *Art. cit.*, p. 138.

⁴ *Three Proper, and wittie, familiar Letters*, London 1580. See Francis R. Johnson, *A Critical Bibliography of the Works of Edmund Spenser* (Baltimore 1933), p. 10.

⁵ Spenser's poem may be conveniently consulted in R. E. Neil Dodge, *The Complete Poetical Works of Edmund Spenser* (Cambridge edition), pp. 770-71. The lines are freely translated by Richard Wilton (Grosart, *Works of Spenser*, 1882-4, I, 434) as follows:

For in this native nook, this dim retreat,
I blush to waste my days; it is not meet
A youth with genius not unblest, should spend
In duties mean, repeated to no end,
The precious morning of his fairest years,
Nor see the hoped-for fruit crown the green ears.

⁶ This relatively modest expression of Spenser's ego could be expected to catch the attention of Milton at the time when he was taking thought "with a sacred reverence and religious advisement how best to undergo." As Mark Pattison observed in connection with the sonnet here discussed, "Nothing in Milton's life is more noteworthy than his deliberate intention to be a great poet."

own state. Indeed, the whole passage in Spenser's poem-letter to Harvey bears a marked resemblance to the famous sonnet which accompanied Milton's English letter to an unidentified friend, perhaps his tutor Thomas Young.⁷ I quote the octave:

How soon hath time the subtle thief of youth,
 Stolen on his wing my three and twentieth year!
 My hasting days fly on with full career,
 But my late spring no bud or blossom showeth.
 Perhaps my semblance might deceive the truth,
 That I to manhood am arrived so near,
 And inward ripeness doth much less appear,
 That some more timely-happy spirits endueth.

Like Spenser, whose Puritan zeal and moral earnestness would have sufficed to prevent him from taking orders in the Anglican Church, Milton in his "father's country house" was also *sinu-in patrio*. The reference in Milton's letter to "my life as yet obscure & unserviceable to mankind" is much like Spenser's *tenebrisque pudendis*.⁸ And the mention in the octave of "bud or blossom" and "inward ripeness" reminds us of the *spicas*⁹ of Spenser's concluding line above; Milton's "hasting days" and "wasting youth" suggest Spenser's *virentes annos*; the "same lot however mean" in the sestet recalls Spenser's *Officijs frustra deperdere vilibus* (cf. Wilton's rendering "should spend / In duties mean"). In Milton's reference to "more timely-happy spirits," which led Smart (p. 54) to suggest the name of Thomas Randolph, can it be that Milton was thinking also of Edmund Spenser, who lived in the golden age of Gloriana? To judge by the apologetic tone of

⁷ For the identification of the "true & unfained freind" with Thomas Young, see Parker, *LTL*, May 16, 1936. Parker (*RES* XI, 1935, 276-83) believes the sonnet was written in December 1632, and the letter in 1633. But see Fletcher's plausible contention (*The Complete Poetical Works of John Milton*, New Cambridge edition, 1941, p. 125) that the sonnet may have been written as early as 1629.

⁸ Later in the first draft of his letter Milton refers to "this Pluto's helmet of obscurity." With his admission that he appears "to dream away [his] years in the arms of studious retirement" compare Wilton's rendering of Spenser: "in . . . this dim retreat, / I blush to waste my days."

⁹ Somewhat similar is the modest complaint of Spenser's master Chaucer in the *Legend of Good Women*, F Prologue, lines 68-77 (F. N. Robinson, *The Complete Works of Geoffrey Chaucer*, p. 569), with its reference to the "ere" and the "corn."

his letter, Milton might appropriately have signed himself "Immerito"!

Smart has pointed out¹⁰ that though the date of Milton's first love-affair is uncertain, it probably took place "many years earlier" than his visit to Italy in 1638. It seems likely that Milton may have contemplated making the Grand Tour even before he left Cambridge—during the period of his intimate friendship with Diodati, his love for the Donna Emilia, and his study of Italian history and poetry, including the sonnets of Giovanni della Casa,—long before he expressed to his father¹¹ his gratitude for the opportunity to study French and Italian:

Addere suasisti quos jactat Gallia flores,
Et quam degeneri novus Italus ore loquellam
Fundit, barbaricos testatus voce tumultus.

If he dreamed of going to Italy, he would have noted particularly the heading of Spenser's poem, "Immerito sui, mox in Gallias navigaturi," and the lines in the poem that deal with Spenser's projected journey.

Moreover, the convention, popular with Italian poets, of concealing the lady's name was applied with marked success, to the bafflement of critics for three centuries, by both Spenser and Milton.¹² The latter was doubtless familiar with it from his study of the Italians, but here, as so frequently elsewhere, Spenser had provided a precedent in English poetry. Milton, with his "new allegiance" to Spenser, could hardly have overlooked E. K.'s gloss on "the feigned name" Rosalinde at the end of the January eclogue. If, as appears probable, Milton was reading the *Shephearδες Calender* about the time of his attachment to the Italian lady,

il cui bel nome honora
L'herbosa val di Reno, e il nobil varco,

E. K.'s mention of "the famous Paragone of Italy, Madonna Coelia" could not well have escaped his notice.

¹⁰ *The Sonnets of Milton*, p. 134.

¹¹ *Ad Patrem*, lines 82-84.

¹² This particular parallel between Spenser and Milton could not have been pointed out before 1921, when Smart's edition of the sonnets first disclosed the name of Milton's *donna*.

The parallel experiences of the two poets at Cambridge have been frequently alluded to.¹³ Milton may even have been aware that his tutor, the "strict Puritan" Thomas Young, who became master of Jesus College, Cambridge in 1644, bore the same surname as the Puritan John Young, Spenser's master at Pembroke, whose secretary (and "Southerne shepheardes boye")¹⁴ Spenser became in 1578, after Young's election as bishop of Rochester (the "Roffy" of the *Shepheardes Calender*). The knowledge of the coincidence of surnames may conceivably have led to Milton's more intent perusal of the Spenser-Harvey correspondence.

Whether Milton drew upon a stock convention or upon Spenser (or both) for his octave it is impossible to determine. But the 1580 edition was doubtless within his reach at Cambridge (possibly even at Horton), and it would appear improbable that the omnivorous young Spenser-conscious reader could have overlooked it. In any event, whether Milton found the idea in Spenser or not, the similarity between the two verse passages is a striking one.

ROLAND M. SMITH

The University of Illinois

JOHN DONNE'S "PARADISE AND CALVARIE"

In the justly famous "Hymne to God my God, in my sicknesse," there is an interesting, but unexplained, allusion:

We thinke that *Paradise* and *Calvarie*,
Christs Crosse, and *Adams tree*, stood in one place.

The relationship between Adam's tree and Christ's cross (involving the legend of Seth's visit to Eden and the story of the tree that grew out of Adam's dead mouth and eventually was made into the Cross)¹ is known to most students of English Literature. The

¹³ See, for example, Grosart, *Works of Spenser*, I, 41.

¹⁴ *The Shepheardes Calender*, April, line 21.

¹ The English legends have been gathered by Morris in *Legends of the Holy Rood*, EETS, XLVI, 1871. See especially "De morte primi parentis Ade et de inceptione crucis Christi"; the Welsh Passion Play is also built around the same tale. See also the two essays on this subject by W. Meyer in *Abhandlungen der Philosophisch-philologischen Classe der König-*

identification of Paradise with Calvary is harder to explain, but it results, I believe, from a cross-breeding of the story of the tree that grew from Adam's mouth and a persistent legend that Adam's grave became the locus of the Cross.

I can find no reference to this second story prior to Origen, who says, "A Hebrew tradition comes down to us that Adam is buried in Calvary; hence as all died in Adam, all shall again be resurrected in Christ."² St. Ambrose, speaking of Golgotha, writes, "Ibi Adae sepulchrum; ut illum mortuum in sua cruce resuscitaret."³ A fuller development of the legend is hinted at in the "Sermo de resurrectione Christi" of the pseudo-Cyprian,⁴ and the complete tale is found in a letter of Paulus and Eustochius to Marcellus:

In hac urbe, imo in hoc tunc loco, et habitasse dicitur, et mortuus esse

lich Bayerischen Akademie der Wissenschaften, XIV (1878), 185 ff. and XVI (1881), 101 ff.

²In *Matthaeum commentariorum series*, PG, XIII, 1777-8: Περὶ τοῦ κρανίου τόπον ἦλθεν εἰς ἡμᾶς ὅτι Ἑβραῖοι παραδιδόασιν, ὅτι τὸ σῶμα τοῦ Ἀδάμ ἐχει τέθαιπται ἵνα ἐπεὶ ἐν τῷ Ἀδὰμ πάντες ἀποθνήσκουσι, πάλιν ἐν τῷ χρίστῳ πάντες ζωοποιηθῶσι. The full story of the burial of Adam after the Flood by Shem and Melchizedec on Golgotha is found in the fifth or sixth century Ethiopic Book of Adam and Eve. The story is told in summary by Nilus in his Letters (PG, LXXIX, 83) and in great detail in the *Annales* of Eutychius (PG, CXI, 911-18). The former work was printed in 1639 and the latter, translated by Pococke and annotated by Selden, in 1658; unless the *Annales* were long in manuscript, they were not available to Donne. References to it were to be found in Epiphanius, *Adversus Haereses* (e. p. 1544); cf. PG, XLI, 843: Διὸ καὶ θαυμάσαι ἔστι τὸν εἰδῶτα, etc. In 1639, however, Selden told the story, with proper references, in his *De Jure Naturali et Gentium*:

Scilicet Adae corpus aromatis, ut ipse moribundus praeceperat, conditum, e Sethianorum monte, ubi in spelunca thesauri repositum est, in medium seu umbilicum telluris postmodum transferendum, idque ex ipsius etiam jussu; atque eam rem ut procuraret, in mandatis dedisse Noacho Lemechum paulo ante obitum. Adae igitur corpus, uti & aliorum patriarchum ita sepulchrum, in arcam secum tulisse Noachum, idque ad exitum vitae ferme retinuisse: Moribundum autem Semo imperasse ut corpus Adae clam inde educeret. . . . Locus scilicet, telluris medium seu umbilicus in traditione hac, est Golgotha, ubi crucifixus Jesus Christus. Quo nomine non semel apud Judaeos Hierosolyma dicuntur. Atque illic a Semo & Melchisedeco repositum juxta mandata illa Adae corpus ibi postea narratur. *Opera* (1726) I, 285.

³Epist. LXXI, PL, XVI, 1297.

⁴*Opera* (ed. Erasmus, Lugduni, 1544), II, 322.

Adam. Unde et locus in quo crucifixus est Dominus noster Calvaria appellatur, scilicet, quod ibi sit antiqui hominis calvaria condita, ut secundus Adam, id est, sanguis Christi de cruce stillans, primi Adam et jacentis protoplasti peccata dilueret.⁵

Though this letter was found among the epistles of Jerome, the great translator and Semitic scholar was not convinced of its truth and expressed his disbelief in several places.⁶ Jerome's arguments against what Origen identified as a Jewish tradition were reechoed verbatim by mediaeval commentators like Bede,⁷ Rabanus Maurus,⁸ Walafridus Strabus,⁹ and others. So the legend was kept alive by being constantly killed. Most English mediaeval legends tell us that Adam was buried in "þe vale of ebron"; but Mandeville, and there must have been others, repeats the tale that Jerome had denied. Thus the legend came down to the Renaissance.

Donne probably knew both the story of the tree of Paradise and the tradition that Adam was buried in Calvary. The commingling of these legends in his imagination is, I think, the source of his allusion. If the tree grew in Adam's grave and Adam was buried on Calvary; then Adam's tree and Christ's cross "stood in one place." But Adam must have been buried in the county of Paradise; hence Calvary must be in Paradise.

DON CAMERON ALLEN

⁵ *PL*, xxii, 485.

⁶ In his commentaries on Matthew 27:33 and Ephesians 5:14; I give the former:

Audivi quemdam exposuisse Calvariae locum, in quo sepultus est Adam, et ideo sic appellatum esse, quia ibi antiqui hominis sit conditum caput, et hoc esse quod Apostolus dicat: *Surge qui dormis, et exsurge a mortuis, et illuminabit te Christus* (*Ephes.* v, 14). Favorabilis interpretatio et mulcens aurem populi, nec tamen vera. Extra urbem enim et foras portam, loca sunt in quibus truncantur capita damnatorum, et Calvariae, id est, decollatorum sumpsere nomen. . . . Sin autem quispiam contendere voluerit, ideo ibi Dominum crucifixum, ut sanguis super Adae tumulum distillaret, interrogemus eum, quare et alii latrones in eodem loco crucifixi sint? Ex quo apparet Calvarium non sepulcrum primi hominis, sed locum significare decollatorum, ut ubi abundavit peccatum, superabundaret gratia (*Rom.* v, 20). Adam vero sepultum juxta Hebron et Arbee, in Jesu filii Nave volumine legimus. *PL*, xxvi, 217-8.

⁷ *PL*, xcii, 123.

⁸ *PL*, cviii, 1136.

⁹ *PL*, cxiv, 174.

AVANT DE PLUS THE INFINITIVE

In the seventeenth century one could employ with the infinitive *avant que*, *avant que de*, or even *avant* alone, but *avant de* is not found in the Grands Ecrivains from Malherbe to Boileau and Bossuet. Yet *avant de* ultimately prevailed, though even in the nineteenth century Littré allowed *avant que de*, which had been the preferred form in the late seventeenth century and the early eighteenth. When did the shortened form come into use? When did *avant de* begin to be employed by writers of distinction?

The only example given by Richelet (1680) is of *avant que de*: "avant que de songer à condamner les gens." Furetière does not mention *avant de* in the first edition of his dictionary (1691). Three years later the dictionary of the French Academy ruled that, when *avant* is employed in this construction, "il est toujours suivi d'un *que*." On the other hand, Furetière's edition of 1727, after citing the Academy's rule, adds:

Cependant quelques-uns, pour abréger, omettent le *que* devant l'infinitif. *Avant de partir*; *avant de manger*.

Though the edition of Richelet that appeared in 1719 failed to note the construction, that of 1759 added to the article on *avant que de* the observation that "Plusieurs bons auteurs du dernier siècle et de celui-ci, suppriment le *que*." Unfortunately the editor did not name these authors or give examples in support of his statement. The earliest examples supplied by Littré are from Voltaire's *Tancrède*, first acted in 1760. M. Albert Cahen helps us little, as he states merely that the "forme *avant de* . . . n'est pas antérieure au XVIII^e siècle."¹ M. Vic enters into greater detail when identifying a manuscript as that of Dufresny's *Dominos*, a play read to the actors of the Comédie Française in 1721. Finding "*avant de se mettre en colère*" in this manuscript, he asserted that this construction

ne remplace guère *avant que de*, dans la langue littéraire, antérieurement à 1715: après 1720, l'expression est d'usage courant, mais aux yeux des puristes, elle passe encore pour une négligence ou un néologisme.²

¹ In his note on Fénelon's changing "*avant partir*" to "*avant que de partir*." Cf. Cahen's edition of *Télémaque*, Paris, Hachette, 1920, II, 455-6.

² *Revue du dix-huitième siècle*, IV (1917), 296.

Examples I have collected will show to what extent this statement is correct.

The first of them comes from *les Intrigues de la Vieille Tour*, a play written by Duperche and published at Rouen by J.-B. Besogne, probably in 1684.³ The example occurs in scene 10:

Il faut qu'il ait touché l'argent
Avant de l'attaquer.

The next example is from a manuscript that also lacks a date, but was in all probability written about 1694, that of *le Docteur amoureux*: "Auant d'estre à vostre service." (III, 4).⁴ As, however, Duperche was an obscure actor and the author of *le Docteur amoureux* is not even known by name, the occurrence of these two examples in the seventeenth century does not contradict M. Vic's statement.

However, there was a great seventeenth-century writer who once used *avant de*: La Bruyère. In the paragraph devoted to absent-minded Ménalque that he added in 1691 to the section of his *Caractères* called "De l'homme" he wrote "avant de prendre congé de luy." The phrase is found first in the sixth edition and was not altered in those published subsequently by the author.⁵ La Bruyère,

³ Cf. my *History of French Dramatic Literature*, Part IV, pp. 556, 559. J.-B. Besogne is known to have published plays as early as 1678 and as late as 1711. The address he gives in *les Intrigues*, "ruë Ecuyer, au Soleil Royal," is that of plays he published in 1682 and in 1691. The ornamental design shown on the title-page is the same as that of Sévigny's *Philipin sentinelle*, and the ornamental letter with which the text begins resembles closely the corresponding letter in the latter play. These facts indicate that one play was published not long after the other. For reasons given in my *op. cit.* I have put the first performance of *Philipin sentinelle* in 1682 or 1683; that of *les Intrigues* in 1683. As it is reasonable to suppose that both plays were published not long after they were first acted, the most probable date for *les Intrigues* is 1684.

⁴ Cf. my *Five French Farces*, Baltimore, 1937, p. 129. An anonymous play called *le Nonchalant* also contains an example of the construction: "Connoitre auant d'aimer, fut toujours ma maxime" (III, 3), but it is by no means sure that this is a seventeenth-century play or even one written before 1720.

⁵ I have examined in the Library of Congress the sixth, seventh, and ninth editions, published respectively at Paris in 1691; at Lyons in 1693; at The Hague and Paris in 1696. The eighth edition, though listed in the catalogue, could not be found, but it is most improbable that it gives the phrase differently from the others.

who wanted to be "peuple," was in this case gratifying his ambition. His usage did not go unnoticed, for one of his critics remarked superciliously that "le Praticien se sert de cette conjonction *avant de*: l'Ecrivain poli ajoute un *que*,"⁶ implying that La Bruyère's legal training had led him to employ a barbarism.

Despite this slur, La Bruyère's example may have encouraged Regnard, who in writing his *Distrain* made use of the paragraph on Ménalque. By examining his comedies one can follow the progress of *avant de*. In the *Joueur* (1696) I find "avant que savoir lire" (I, 10) and "avant que de parler" (III, 6); in the *Distrain* (1697) "avant que de penser" (IV, 6) and "avant d'accorder" (V, 3); in *le Retour imprévu* (1700) "avant que de partir" (sc. 4). But in the eighteenth century he not only adopted *avant de*, but he made of it his preferred form. *Les Folies amoureuses* (1704) has "Avant de nous quitter" (I, 5); *les Ménechmes* (1705), "avant de l'avoir vu" (III, 4) and "avant de partir" (IV, 3); *le Légataire universel* (1708), "avant de couronner ses feux" (I, 1), "avant de partir" (II, 2), and "avant de conclure" (V, 8), whereas it gives the longer construction only once: "avant que de rien rendre" (V, 8).

La Grange-Chancel followed a similar pattern. In his *Adherbal*, published in 1699, he wrote (I, 5) "avant que de me voir" and in his *Athénaïs*, which left the press on Jan. 2, 1700, "Avant que de regner" (I, 1), but in the latter tragedy he also wrote (IV, 7) "avant de remplir cette place," and in *Amasis*, published late in 1701, he gave one example of *avant de* along with two of *avant que de*:

Avant de l'immoler, je veux que son raport, . . . (II, 4)
 Avant que de sortir mets le comble à ta rage. (III, 2)
 Avant que d'exposer une tête si chère. (V, 2)

His preference may have been determined by the number of syllables he had at his disposal in writing these verses, but Lesage was free in his prose to avoid *avant de* if he cared to do so. I have found in the first edition⁷ of *le Diable boiteux* (1707) five examples

⁶ Quoted from the anonymous *Sentimens critiques sur les Caractères* of 1701 by Brunot, *Histoire de la langue française*, IV, 2^e partie (1924), 1018-9.

⁷ I have followed the text of *La Renaissance du livre* (Paris, Gillequin), which is said to have been "soigneusement collationné" on that of the first edition.

of *avant que de*⁸ and two of *avant de*: "avant d'arriver en cet endroit" and "avant de commencer aucune affaire."⁹ In 1726 the passage containing the first of these last two examples was omitted, while the second example was changed to "avant que je commence." As Lesage made similar alterations in regard to only two examples of *avant que de* out of five, he had apparently become more conservative as he grew older. But he had already supported by two examples the usage sanctioned by La Bruyère, La Grange-Chancel, and Regnard. Four authors of their standing were enough, I should think, to prevent *avant de* from being subsequently considered either a "négligence" or a "néologisme." Certainly its occurrence in a manuscript by Dufresny does not show that the document could not be earlier than 1720.

I conclude that the modern expression may have been recorded as early as 1684, that it was certainly employed by a distinguished writer in 1691, and that it established itself in good usage as a variant of *avant que de* in the period 1700-1708.

H. CARRINGTON LANCASTER

COMPLETION OF A TEXT OF RAÏMBAUT D'AURENGA

When Carl Appel edited Raïmbaut d'Aurenga's poem *Car vei ge clars chanz s'abriva*,¹ he omitted the seventh stanza, and gave only the MS. readings, saying that he could make no satisfactory sense of them. I realize how presumptuous it is to try to glean after such a reaper; nevertheless, I think that a perfectly good reading can be obtained, and I offer my version here. These are the MS. readings, as Appel gives them:²

⁸ Chaps. IV (p. 46), XII (p. 113), XIV (p. 141), XV (pp. 168, 170).

⁹ Chap. IX, pp. 92, 94.

¹ Bartsch 389, 23 (or 38); in *ZRPh.*, XLIX, 484 ff.

² The version marked NN² was established by Constans from those two MSS. in *Revue des langues romanes*, 19, 272; it is obviously unsatisfactory, and the few rejected variants do not help.

NN²

a

- | | |
|--|---|
| <p>37 Que nom es clars ab que · s pliva
 amix si gems e mentirs
 no i es si que l'us adirs
 40 no i vegna avan q'om viva
 qu'om non ama finamens
 senes gran temensa gaia.</p> | <p>Qe non es clars ab com pliva
 amics ni ab genz mentirs
 si nō tem so camatirs
 leu deu venir anz quel viva
 com non ama finamenz
 ses granz alques gaia.</p> |
|--|---|

The best MS. is a, which I shall follow whenever possible, just as Appel does. I reconstruct the text thus:

Qe non es clars ab c'om pliva
amics, ni ab genz mentirs;
si non tem so c'am', adirs
leu deu venir anz qu'el viva;
c'om non ama finamenz
ses gran temens' alques gaia.

This would mean: "For a friend is not (made) glad with promises nor with gracious lies. If he does not fear what he loves, hatred must needs come easily before he (really) lives; for one does not love truly without a great, but somewhat cheerful, fear."

It is not the text (substantially that of a), but this interpretation, that we must justify. The general sense fits perfectly, since Raimbaut has said in the preceding stanza that he does not know whether his lady is "hard or friendly" toward him, and that he fears her so much that a clarification of her attitude would be welcome. The individual details offer a few difficulties.

37. *Ab que* can hardly mean "provided that," as it usually does. But I see no objection to taking the two *ab*'s as exactly parallel, one introducing a phrase (*ab genz mentirs*), the other a clause with subjunctive verb (*ab c'om pliva*); it is doubtless from this use of *ab* with a clause that the specialized meaning of *ab que* developed. A more accurate translation here would be "with one's promising," or "with the (mere) fact that one promises." The subjunctive, as in the usual *ab que* clause, is hypothetical. *Pliva* is the present subjunctive of *plevir*; Raynouart gives the variant *plivir*, with an example from Raimon de Castelnau: *ab cars vendre et ab pliven mentir*.

39-40. "If a lover takes his lady's love for granted, it may easily turn to hatred before he lives in the full sense of the word"—that is, before he succeeds in enjoying her favors. This, I think, is not straining unduly the meaning of *deu*: it will necessarily be easy

for hatred to come. And this pregnant meaning of "live" is common in all languages; living without his lady's love, or in suspense, is only half living.

42. The line is too short in a, and the meaning is clearly incomplete. One could simply adopt the reading of NN² *senes gran temensa gaia*, which satisfies both meter and sense; but I prefer to keep the reading of a and insert *temens'* from NN². The *alges* smooths the paradox of a "great cheerful fear"; and although Raïmbaut is quite capable of this sort of thing, there is no need to ascribe it to him on every occasion. Besides, it would be easier for the scribe of a to omit the word *temens'* than to invent *alges* out of whole cloth.

Thus we have established a text and an interpretation that seem reasonably sound.

FRANK McMINN CHAMBERS

Colorado College

A COMPARISON OF SIMMS'S *RICHARD HURDIS* WITH ITS SOURCES

In the "Introduction" to *Richard Hurdis* (1838) Simms says that this story is a genuine chronicle of the border region where the scene is laid and that the events take place during the period which he assigns. He states that the action is founded on well known facts and that the personages are real living men, acting and suffering as he here reports. The author declares that he knew Stewart, the captor of Murrell, personally, and had several conferences with him before the publication of *Richard Hurdis*. He admits having elaborated and filled out some characters and scenes, however, as is within the province of the artist.

In fact, Simms informs the reader that the book is an account of the activities of the "Murrell gang," a famous band of outlaws who operated throughout Alabama and Mississippi during the early thirties. The Foster of the book is really John A. Murrell, the organizer and leader of the gang; and Richard Hurdis is actually Virgil Stewart, the man who tracked down and captured Murrell and broke up the band.

A comparison of *Richard Hurdis* with two contemporary accounts

of the "Murrell gang," which were probably Simms's sources,¹ reveals certain discrepancies. According to *Richard Hurdis*, Murrell was an honest boy, without parents and friends, who continued to be honest until he reached manhood.² If one may believe the "histories," however, Murrell's parents were living. Murrell himself pays tribute to his father as an honest man. He says that it was his mother, who, from the cradle up, taught him how to steal and who led him into a life of villainy by the time he had reached the early age of ten. He relates how he first stole goods from a peddler who lodged at their house.³

In *Richard Hurdis* Simms says that the first meeting between Hurdis (Stewart) and Foster (Murrell) occurred on a boat trip on the Tombigbee River, not far from the town of Columbus in western Georgia.⁴ Simms represents that Hurdis had disguised himself as a gambler in order to track down the gang, whom he suspected of the murder of his friend, William Carrington. During a stroll on shore one night, Foster took Hurdis into his confidence and revealed to him the organization and the activities of the "Mystic Confederacy." According to Walton's and Howard's accounts,⁵ however, Stewart (Hurdis) first meets Murrell (Foster) in Madison County, Tennessee. The circumstances of their meeting and acquaintance are also different from those described by Simms. Stewart's friend, the Reverend John Henning, had had two negroes stolen. He suspected Murrell of the theft and commissioned Stewart to follow him and find out the truth. Stewart overtook Murrell on the road, made his acquaintance, and adroitly drew him out, so that Murrell revealed himself as the organizer and leader of a vast criminal organization extending over the entire

¹ A. Q. Walton, *A History of the Detection, Conviction, Life, and Designs of John A. Murrell, the Great Western Land Pirate* (Athens, Tenn., 1835); and H. R. Howard, *The History of Virgil A. Stewart And His Adventures in Capturing And Exposing the Great Western Land Pirate* (New York, 1836). W. P. Trent, *William Gilmore Simms* (Boston, 1892), p. 116, refers briefly to the factual basis of *Richard Hurdis* and mentions the author's conversations with Stewart and his reliance on "Stewart's own narrative of his experiences"—the volume by Walton. But the statement that Simms "stuck closely to his authorities" indicates that Trent made no effort to compare the novel with its sources.

² *Richard Hurdis* (New York, n. d.), pp. 312-314.

³ Walton, *op. cit.*, p. 30.

⁴ *Richard Hurdis*, pp. 300-301.

⁵ Walton, *op. cit.*, pp. 8-15, and Howard, *op. cit.*, pp. 12-35.

Southwest. By artful questions and a perfect dissimulation Stewart pretended to be in sympathy with Murrell's guarded admission of his criminal accomplishments. When Murrell perceived this, he related the entire history of his life, pouring into the ears of the startled and now thoroughly alarmed Stewart the history of an astounding and revolting series of crimes.

It is only in a very general way that Simms follows the available contemporary source material. He is fairly accurate when he is telling of the nature of the organization, of its size, of its extent, and of the kinds of crimes which it practiced. But when it comes to specific details, such as the meeting places of the clan, he does not follow the supposedly factual accounts. The Sipsy Swamp between Columbus and Tuscaloosa, described so vividly by Simms as a meeting place of the clan,⁶ is not even mentioned by either of the books he probably used as sources. Indeed, most of the specific events used by Simms, such as the long pursuit of the traitor Eberley by members of the clan,⁷ or the final battle in which the Brotherhood is attacked and dispersed by officers of the law⁸ and Murrell escapes by floating off on a bale of cotton down the Mississippi River, seem to be entirely products of Simms's creative imagination.

FLOYD H. DEEN

Indiana University

HAWTHORNE'S NOTE TO "DR. HEIDEGGER'S EXPERIMENT"

Apparently no one has ever been curious enough about Hawthorne's note to "Dr. Heidegger's Experiment" to investigate the facts regarding the charge and counter charge of plagiarism mentioned in it. The note runs as follows:

NOTE: In an English review not long since, I have been accused of plagiarising the idea of this story from a chapter in one of the novels of Alexandre Dumas. There has undoubtedly been a plagiarism on one side or the other; but as my story was written a good deal more than twenty years ago, and as the novel is of considerably more recent date, I take pleasure in thinking that M. Dumas has done me the honor to appropriate one of the fanciful conceptions of my earlier days. He is heartily welcome to it; nor

⁶ *Richard Hurd*, pp. 320-321; 328-329.

⁷ *Ibid.*, pp. 328-376.

⁸ *Ibid.*, pp. 395-403.

is it the only instance, by many, in which the great French romancer has exercised the privilege of commanding genius by confiscating the intellectual property of less famous people to his own use and behoof. *September, 1860.*¹

Briefly the facts are these. "Dr. Heidegger's Experiment" was published as "The Fountain of Youth" in the *Knickerbocker* for January, 1837, whereas the novel mentioned in the review²—*Mémoires d'un Médecin*—was published as a serial from 1846 to 1848 inclusive, or from nine to eleven years after the short story. Both the story and a chapter in the novel treat of an elixir to restore youth to the aged, but beyond the general theme, which itself dates from classical mythology, no striking similarity exists. Of Hawthorne's main thesis that man, if restored to youth, would commit the same follies over again, there is not the slightest hint in the Dumas episode.

The inconsequent reference to Hawthorne and Dumas by the English reviewer could only by some stretch of the imagination be labelled a charge. He had written:

In "Dr. Heidegger's Experiment" (which we fancy may have been suggested by a scene in Dumas' *Mémoires d'un Médecin*), we are taught that, if we could renew our youth by some Medean draft, we should, unless altered in other respects, commit the same follies as we have now to look back to.³

That Hawthorne did not rest his defense merely in exposing the patent absurdity of this suggestion of influence and that he appears not to have read the French novel before levelling his counter charge demonstrate once again that even the great are human and fallible.⁴

VICTOR E. GIBBENS

Purdue University

¹ *The Complete Writings of Nathaniel Hawthorne*, 22 vols. (Old Manse Edition, Houghton, Mifflin and Company, 1900), I, 323. Although written in 1860, the note, so far as I can discover, first appeared in print in *Twice-Told Tales*, Ticknor & Fields (Blue and Gold Edition), Boston, 1864, this being the first new edition after the writing of the note.

² "Nathaniel Hawthorne," *Universal Review*, III (June, 1860), 742-771. Reprinted in *Littell's Living Age*, LX (June 23, 1860), 707-723. The reprint only was consulted, as the *Universal Review* (not listed in the *Union List of Serials*) was not available.

³ *Littell's Living Age*, LX (June 23, 1860), 711.

⁴ Moncure D. Conway in his *Life of Nathaniel Hawthorne*, Walter Scott, London, undated, page 68, was undoubtedly accepting Hawthorne's charge at its face value when he wrote that "Dr. Heidegger's Experiment" had been "partly appropriated by Dumas."

AN EARLY SCHILLER LETTER

The following letter, which recently came into my possession,¹ was printed by Jonas (I, no. 105) from a copy so inaccurate, that it is advisable to reprint the entire letter here:

S. T.

Eben erhalte ich von H. von Dalberg folgenden Einschluß an Sie, und weil ich jezt gerade zur Unzeit zum Mittagessen wohin engagiert bin, und nicht gleich selbst zu Ihnen kommen kann, so ²

Der Inhalt des Briefs wird eine Bitte des Barons seyn, ein Mscrpt von mir zurückzuschicken, das durch seine Ubereilung unter andre Papiere kam. Sie werden, wenn Sie es gelesen haben, finden, daß *Sie* Selbst es zwar ohne Anstand lesen, aber nicht mittheilen dürften. Dalbergs und *meine* Ideen, die wir kürzlich der T. Gesellschaft vortrugen oder vortragen ließen, sind sehr unter unserm Wunsch aufgenommen worden, und mit Mißvergnügen habe ich von Seiten einiger Mitglieder die Bemerkung gemacht, daß alle Institute zur Beförderung der Schönen Litteratur und Kunst wenig Eingang bei Männern finden, die es unter der Würde eines Mannes halten, sich laut für etwas in diesem Fach zu erklären. Diese Empfindungen ³ konnte ich wol einem Freunde der Litteratur gestehen, aber es ist natürlich, daß die Art wie ich sie vortrage, für diejenige die sich allenfalls getroffen glauben könnten, zu ekigt ist. Sie werden also die Güte haben, und das Manuscript entweder mir selbst, oder Dalbergen durch Rennschüb zurückgeben.⁴ Meine Idee zu einem Journal der Gesellschaft wird nie nach meinem Wunsch in Erfüllung gehn; Ich wolte einen grossen Schritt zur Beförderung des Theaters thun, und behalte mir vor, Sie bei einem Plan zu einer Mannheimer Dramaturgie als Freund und *quasi* Verleger um das Nähere zu fragen. Wenn ich allenfalls heute nicht in die T. Gesellschaft kommen könnte, so treffe ich Sie doch Morgen, und Wann?

Frid. Schiller.

The letter is written on one side of a thin sheet of paper 9 inches broad and 7½ inches high, showing a crown as the top half of the

¹ See M. Breslauer, London, Cat. 52, No. 425 (1939), who misread the superscription *S. T.* (= *Salvo Titulo*) as *L. S.*, and assumed that the letter was addressed "to his publisher Schwan." The letter had been offered previously in Liepmanssohn's Auction Catalogue of March 8, 1886, No. 812, where likewise the addressee is assumed to be Schwan. See Fritz Jonas, *Schillers Briefe* I, p. 488.

² There is no punctuation here.

³ The last syllable is indicated by a long, curved stroke.

⁴ Originally *zurückzugeben*.

watermark. On the verso, in the upper right corner, is the notation in a different, heavy hand: *Mannheim H Schiller den 9ten Juny 84.*

That the addressee is Anton von Klein appears from Schiller's letter of June 4, 1784, in which he suggests to Heribert von Dalberg to write "noch heute Abend an H. Klein, unter welchem Vorwand als Sie für wichtig genug halten, daß er alle ihm zugeschickten Papiere auf der Stelle durch H. Rennschüb an Sie verabfolgen lassen soll." (Jonas, I, No. 104.) Again, on June 7 (Jonas, I, No. 106) Schiller advises von Dalberg: "Der bedenkliche Umstand mit meinem Mscrpt . . . ich hab es wieder in Händen, und Klein dachte auch nicht mit einem Gedanken daran, daß ein Misbrauch gemacht werden könnte." These two letters also serve to fix the date of our letter as June 5, 1784.

W. KURRELMMEYER

REVIEWS

The Tragic Muse of John Ford. By G. F. SENSABAUGH. Stanford University, California: Stanford University Press, 1944. Pp. xii + 190.

In this interesting book Professor Sensabaugh describes what he believes to be the intellectual structure of John Ford's tragedies. His theses are two. The first is that Ford adopted from his study of Burton's *Anatomy of Melancholy* the essential doctrines of scientific determinism. For Burton, so the author maintains, by establishing the physical causes of conduct, particularly of passion, makes vice and virtue physical, not moral phenomena. It is because Ford adopted this attitude toward the struggles of his characters that many critics from Lamb to Havelock Ellis have looked upon this dramatist as a prophet of modern modes of thought. Professor Sensabaugh states his conclusion on this point in the following provocative fashion:

What Freud seems to have done for Eugene O'Neill Burton accomplished for John Ford; for both playwrights insist that character is determined by forces beyond human control. In this insistence upon the physical basis of character, Ford removes human activity from the realm of ethical choice, and, anticipating the exponents of modern thought, looks at life with amoral eyes.

If Ford was a convert to the doctrines of scientific determinism, it is difficult to believe that his conversion was due to his reading of the *Anatomy of Melancholy*. Burton wrote as a physician, pre-

scribing medicine for diseases of the mind. "Why not," he exclaims, "a melancholy divine . . . profess physick." And he makes his elaborate analysis of "heroical love" in order to suggest remedies for the disease. He never suggests that a victim of that combination of humors which produces headlong passion is beyond the reach of will and moral imperative. On the contrary his work is full of such statements as this:

Many are of opinion that in this blind, headstrong passion counsel can do no good . . . But without question good counsel and advice must needs be of great force, especially if it shall proceed from a wise, fatherly, reverend discreet person.

If Ford saw in Burton a scientific determinist, he misread him.

Professor Sensabaugh's second thesis is that Ford espoused the cause of unbridled individualism, particularly as it asserted itself in love. In this way he "associated himself with the spirit of his day." The source of these emancipated notions of love was Queen Henrietta Maria. For she enthusiastically espoused the ideals of Platonic love and influenced her courtiers to adopt the practices of the cult. In the Queen's mind and that of some of her coterie, the doctrines retained their pristine purity. To them love was an exalted state of soul and contemptuous of physical desire. To give this sort of love precedence over all other human obligations was mere sentimental extravagance. But many English courtiers, though privately amused at these high-falutin notions, found it convenient to exploit them in the interest of their frank sensuality.

Ford, according to Professor Sensabaugh, is of this second company in that he applies the ethics of court Platonism to sexual love. But he does so not as did the Restoration wits with leering self-satisfaction, but in serious advocacy of a morality higher than convention or law. In other words Ford sympathized with the extravagant desires of his lovers and so "belittled marital ties and argued convincingly for individual rights" in amorous experience.

The truth of parts of this theory Professor Sensabaugh has unquestionably established. Ford's lovers when swayed by uncontrolled passion do exhibit just those symptoms which Burton describes as signs of "heroical love." Bassanes the jealous husband in *The Broken Heart* is a pathological case described with obvious reference to Burton. Moreover the lovers do adopt most of the doctrines of platonic love. They act on the belief that beauty and love are more authentic guides to virtuous conduct than convention or law. But it is quite another thing to insist, as does Sensabaugh, that Ford adopted the moral attitude of the most extreme of his lovers, that he too believed that nothing dictated by love could be sin. As a writer of love-tragedies, he had of course to win some sympathy for the lovers, but he invariably shows that in their unsuccessful struggles with custom and morality, they meet inevitable disaster.

It is surely fair to examine Professor Sensabaugh's views where he makes his strongest case—in his analysis of *Tis Pity She's a Whore*. He writes of this play,

Lavishing all his sympathy and some of his best poetry upon these characters [Giovanni and Annabella], Ford seems to suggest that they are right and his more conventional people . . . are wrong.

And he goes on to insist that in this play Ford portrays the inevitable defeat of conventional ethics in its conflict with immutable physical forces. This seems to me an anachronistic point of view. It is extremely doubtful if any contemporary of John Ford could have passed such a judgment on this tragedy. For the dramatic treatment of both Annabella and Giovanni falls into tragic moulds conventional at the time. Annabella, like the protagonists of homiletic plays, is thrown into despair by the consciousness of her sin. She weeps and wrings her hands at her confession to the Friar and asks him in deep agony, "Is there no way to redeem my miseries?" And at the beginning of the fifth act he makes a conventional gallow's speech of repentance and warning to future generations to avoid her sin and her fate. "O, Time," she cries

. . . bear to ages that are yet unborn,
A wretched, woeful woman's tragedy.

Giovanni is fitted neatly into a different but no less conventional tragic formula. A Jacobean dramatist had no surer and more expeditious way of stamping a character as a villain than to brand him an "atheist," a kind of synonym for Machiavellian. And Ford in the very first scene of *Tis Pity* presents Giovanni as an atheist, a free-thinker in both religion and morality. Ford's audience would expect a man thus ticketed to follow a course of crime to the abysses of disaster and death. It would know that the Friar's warning to Giovanni that "death waits on thy lust" was forecasting the course of the dramatic action. Giovanni does justify his incestuous love for his sister by appealing to a mixture of the principles of *préciosité* and the imperatives of heroic love. He cries

Tis my destiny
That you must either love or I must die

and "Love me or kill me, sister." And he is sure that the depth of their love will take away all soil from their conduct. But since Ford had carefully stigmatized him as a villain, Giovanni in perverting these principles of Platonic love for his own devices would seem to his audiences a devil's advocate. In like fashion the manifestations of his wild passion taken from Burton's *Anatomy* they would accept as symptoms of amorous hybris very like that of the doting Mark Antony and as clear a foreboding of his fall.

Ford's other plays are even less endorsements of the doctrines of scientific determinism and individualistic morality. *The Broken Heart* which dramatizes the pathetic situation of Lady Penelope Rich and Sir Philip Sidney is a tragic tale of a girl faithful to the sanctity of trothplight. Penthea's infidelity to her vows through forced submission to the embraces of a fool and a brute was an insult to her finer instincts that any sensitive girl might feel. Her suicide for love is only a conventional extravagance of romance. To see in her situation, as does Professor Sensabaugh, Ford's approval of her abandonment of morals to follow science is to look at the play with eyes asquint. And to say that "in both nature and function *The Broken Heart* matches Ibsen's *Ghosts* or Eugene O'Neill's *Strange Interlude*," is to pull completely out of shape familiar seventeenth-century dramatic patterns.

In other words Professor Sensabaugh has been overenthusiastic in estimating the importance of influences exerted by Burton's analyses of passion and of the formulae of court Platonism upon John Ford's tragedies. He has satisfied every unbiassed reader that Ford drew upon both sources to give substance to his plays and that much of their intensity can be traced to the conflict of these systems of ideas with traditional morality. But the critic has, in my opinion, failed to prove that these importations induced Ford to attack custom and morality because they bar man from realizing celestial love, which is the only true custodian of his health and sanity.

OSCAR JAMES CAMPBELL

Columbia University

Shakespeare & Jonson, their reputations in the seventeenth century compared. By GERALD EADES BENTLEY. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1945. Vol. I (discussion), pp. 149, \$2.50. Vol. II (allusions), pp. 307, \$6.00. Both vols., \$7.50.

Professor Bentley has discovered in seventeenth century books and manuscripts 59 allusions to Shakespeare and 1,079 allusions to Jonson not listed by earlier compilers. One can feel only admiration and gratitude for the wide reading, the alertness, and the faithful recording that have provided us with these new materials. They have been presented with scrupulous care in a well-planned and pleasing volume.

This reviewer's enthusiasm does not extend to the supplementary work to which, in the nature of the case, he must devote his discussion. In a separate volume, Professor Bentley weighs the significance of the Shakespeare-Jonson allusion material and comes

to what he considers new and surprising conclusions. Ambiguity of language makes it difficult for us to determine what these conclusions are, and forces us to choose between alternatives: if the author means one thing, his conclusions are not new; if he means another, his conclusions are new but almost certainly mistaken. The terms "literary reputation" and "popularity" are not synonymous, and in demonstrating that Jonson had the greater "literary reputation" in the seventeenth century, where demonstration was scarcely needful, Professor Bentley has not, as he seems to believe, proved that Jonson had the greater "popularity." All would be well if the author had persisted in the use of the saving phrase "among writers," but this he fails to do—most disastrously in his concluding chapter. Failure to define terms and a curious inflexibility of mind in the presence of statistics account for the disparity in merit between the author's fresh facts and his fresh opinions.

Our uneasiness begins as soon as Professor Bentley defines an allusion and eliminates all that do not fit his definition. He exercises his shears impartially on the Shakespeare and Jonson lists, but the process in practice bears down more heavily on the former. A law demanding amputation of all height in excess of six feet would work greater hardships, however impartially administered, on those who are six feet one than on those who are five feet eleven. Who is to define ideal height? and who is to define an allusion? Professor Bentley's decision that publication records are not valid allusions eliminates 293 items from the Shakespeare list and only 53 from the Jonson. But if our object is to measure the "popularity" of the two men, the publication records seem so relevant that either we should revise our definition of an allusion or abandon allusions as a gauge.

Having pared the "valid" allusions to 1430 for Shakespeare and 1839 for Jonson, Professor Bentley sets the two to running their race, pointing out that Jonson wins numerically both in the century as a whole and in nearly every decade. It is when the allusions are classified in twenty different categories that we perceive that the contestants are not running the same course. There is more allusion to Shakespeare's characters and acting rôles and more spontaneous quotation from his works, more allusion to Jonson as a great writer and public figure and more mention of his titles. There are 178 complete poems about Jonson and only 54 about Shakespeare. But do these figures reveal so much about "popularity" or even "literary reputation" as about the peculiar customs relating to commendatory verse? On the reviewer's desk is a copy of William Cartwright's *Comedies, Tragi-comedies, with other Poems*, 1651. It contains 56 complete poems in praise of this little author, some of prodigious length and one even asserting that in Cartwright "Ben Jonson held Shakespeare's quill." What can be the significance of figures that make Shakespeare run second, in this

category, not only to Jonson but even to William Cartwright? Can we ignore as a matter dealing with publication and not allusion that, in spite of the 56 poems, the single edition of Cartwright's works proved to be sufficient?

There are 89 allusions to *Catiline* and only 52 to *Henry IV*, 1 and 2, and *Merry Wives of Windsor*. Was *Catiline* more popular, then, than Shakespeare's three plays combined? If so, why are there 131 allusions to Falstaff the character and only 7 to *Catiline* the character? Which is the better gauge of the power of penetration of Dickens's little story—the number of printed references to its title or the fact that "old Scrooge" has become proverbial? In discussing Pepys's Diary, Professor Bentley points out that Jonson is praised, Shakespeare disparaged, but it seems more significant that Shakespeare performances are mentioned 37 times, Jonson performances only 22. If most playgoers preferred Jonson to Shakespeare, the theatre managers were singularly obtuse. Incidentally if all playgoers had kept diaries and mentioned performances of Shakespeare and Jonson in the ratio of 37 to 22 what would have happened to Professor Bentley's statistics and their tiny majorities? We cannot say an allusion is an allusion, and give each the value of *one*. An allusion to a performance implies many spectators, whereas a commendatory poem leaves the number of readers in doubt.

Without accepting either alone as a gauge of absolute worth, we need only look about to recognize that "popularity" and "literary reputation" are cousins of varying removes, and are sometimes even wholly unrelated. My literary friends tell me without hesitation that Yeats is a greater poet than Kipling; yet it is Kipling whom they are able to quote. What a tremendous tome a T. S. Eliot allusion book would be! Could we guess from their nineteenth century literary reputations that Scott's verse was more widely read than Wordsworth's? or that, even in England, Longfellow's was more widely read than Tennyson's or Browning's? What of novelists like Proust and Joyce? Everyone who reads them "alludes" to the fact, and those who read them extensively feel that they have earned the right to record the experience in print. There are authors whom it is now "correct" to admire just as in the seventeenth century for different, but similarly exclusive, reasons it was "correct" to admire Jonson. For a university man to prefer him was a matter of elementary loyalty.

Jonson as a truly great writer had some measure of popularity as well as literary reputation, and Shakespeare some measure of literary reputation as well as popularity, but the distinction between them is clear enough in the main. As an entertainer of the court, as a colorful personality, as a center of a literary circle, as a creator of critical issues, and a citizen by naturalization of Academic-land, Jonson naturally called forth a greater volume of testimony from bookish people than did Shakespeare, who, primarily, was only a

writer whom people liked. Although he has not made the issue clear, and seems insufficiently aware of its importance, Professor Bentley's work even in the less admirable volume, performs a service. He himself has provided the tabulations with which we combat him. His clear and systematic arrangement of his material leaves us free to interpret it as we please. If he were not so reliable a scholar, his facts might have created a false impression—a much more serious matter than his expression of opinions with which we respectfully disagree.

ALFRED HARBAGE

University of Pennsylvania

Shakespearian Comedy and Other Studies. By GEORGE GORDON.
Oxford University Press, 1944. Pp. vii + 158. \$2.50.

The friends of the late president of Magdalen College, Oxford, have piously issued a selection (made by Sir Edmund Chambers) from his writings on Shakespeare. The book, consisting of a dozen essays, contains some matter already in print: Gordon's well-known S. P. E. tract on Shakespeare's English, a revised version of the introduction to his edition of *The Tempest* (1912), considerable portions of his introduction to *Twelfth Night* (1915), now recast as a lecture on "The World of the Comedies." The remainder is made up of extracts from lectures, some of them quite short and obviously never intended to stand alone.¹ The "other studies" include lectures on "*Othello*, or the Tragedy of the Handkerchief" and "A Note on the World of *King Lear*."

Gordon approaches his principal subject through a lecture which cogently restates the case against Meredith's and Bergson's view of comedy. He comes to grips with it in "Shakespeare's Answer" and "The World of the Comedies" and adds footnotes to it in "The Dislike of Comedy," "Shakespeare's Women" and "Shakespeare's Clowns." "Shakespeare's Answer" is the most substantial discussion of the subject. It states persuasively the claims of romance. Shakespearian comedy is an "incomparable rainbow mixture of Old England and Utopia." "The World is made of Life and Hope: the Shakespearian Comedy is a portrait of the World." Shakespeare makes the world safe for women; the romance of the comedies may have been his escape from the blood and battle of the concurrent histories. His subject is love in idleness; "most of these plays begin with some artificial seclusion or segregation from the world," but

¹ One cannot help wondering whether it might not have been better to print one lecture intact instead of the less distinguished of these snippets, which have little but wit to recommend them. Or whether Gordon's forthright and judicious introduction to *Hamlet* (1912) does not better deserve the wider acquaintance which reprinting would gain for it.

"Life always comes in and claims its due." The comedies wage "a holy war, conducted without malice or bloodshed on Egotism, Sentimentalism, Pedantry, and Self-importance."

There is no quarrel with these excellent sentiments, nor indeed with anything in the whole book. One's feeling of disappointment on closing it is due to what one doesn't find there. Writing on one of the most challenging subjects in Shakespeare, Gordon is content with a mediocrity of success. To be sure, it is idle to censure him, most of all when he himself is not responsible for the appearance of his lectures in print. He does not address critics and scholars, but Laodiceans in the enjoyment of Shakespeare, and he knows how to kindle their interest. No doubt, too, the exigencies of the lecture excuse his desultoriness, his discursiveness, his appeals *ad hominem*, his refusing the high jumps. Yet the inveterate humorist and steady observer of these lectures often seems happily qualified to take all of Shakespeare's comedy to be his province and to survey it with the most sensitive instruments. He chose not to do so, was perhaps debarred from doing so. So be it. The book is welcome as it is. Its virtues are a lively sympathy with its subject, lucidity, and wit. The tone is warm, the style incisive, the humor pervasive. Of its kind there is nothing better.

M. A. SHABER

University of Pennsylvania

Machiavelli's THE PRINCE, An Elizabethan Translation. Edited with an introduction and notes from a manuscript in the collection of Mr. Jules Furthman, by HARDIN CRAIG. The University of North Carolina Press, 1944. Pp. xlii + 177. \$3.50.

It is well known that the name of Machiavelli in late sixteenth and early seventeenth century England meant two different things. To some—Spenser, Sidney, Raleigh, Bacon and, later, Milton—he was a political theorist of importance. These men presumably read the original. The other suggestion of Machiavelli's name—associated with Old Nick and exemplified by *Alphonsus Emperor of Germany*—is commonly supposed to be derived from Gentillet's *Anti-Machiavel* through Paterick's rendering into English; other continental attacks on Machiavelli seem not to have been translated.

Until recently it has been believed that a man confined to the English language had, before Dacres' translation of *The Prince* in 1640, no means of knowing what that little book really said. But in the past few years various manuscript copies of translations have been found. One of these, with abundant references to the others, is printed in the attractive volume now under review.

What sort of Englishman wished a translation of *The Prince*?

There must have been much demand for an English version, since a number of manuscripts have come to light. Many others must have been current; in fact the one now printed is shown by internal evidence to be a copy, as Mr Craig says. One devoted English student of Machiavelli who relied on translations is known to us, namely Francis Quarles. His *Observations concerning Princes and States and upon Peace and Warre* (1642) and the first century of his *Enchyridion* (1641), from which the later work is partly taken, are to a great extent from Machiavelli. A hasty survey indicates that about one-fifth of the sections of the first century are taken from *The Prince*; other sections are from the *Discourses on Livy* or the *Art of War*. Mr Haight is right in saying that Quarles seems to have used Dacres' translation (*RES*, 12 (1936), 154) though with freedom. I find no indication that the manuscript translation was known to him. But if a man of Quarles' education was waiting for Dacres, there must have been many Englishmen glad to read an English *Prince* in manuscript.

The manuscript presented by Mr Craig is, as may be inferred from the printed version, not without copyist's mistakes. For example, *alwayes* (p. 11) is his error for the two words *al wayes* (*tutte le porte*); *continewe a wholle seege together* (46) means *continue the siege a whole year*; *of the crueltie* (46) seems to lack *of the enemy*; *thereby doth he learne to fynde owte his coon-ninge* (64) suggests alternatives (*learne . . . fynde owte*) of which one should have been crossed out by the translator. The translation is so free that the boundary between freedom and error is hard to set; in the reference to *Duke Lewes* (p. 6) the rendering is not that of the modern Italian text; the translator says that the errors of the King *coultde never have hurte him* (*possevano non lo offendere*—p. 13); *to overcom* (59) should be *to be overcome*; it is said that the Spanish and Germans at Ravenna were *both usinge the same order of fyghte as the Swisers* (p. 119), whereas the point of the passage is that the Spanish used a different method; and there are many misleading renderings.

Deliberate is the use of figures that changes the tone of the work; I have recorded nineteen metaphors not in the Italian and presumably there are others. In other respects the translator has given Machiavelli his own style, as when he reminds us of Euphuus by writing *sett a fayre varnishe on his fowle vyce* (76); incidentally the *fowle vyce* is not in the original; similarly Euphuistic is *rather take pleasure to passe their tymes delicately, then paynes to practise armes diligentlie* (63); many others could be cited. Another frequent trick of style is the use of two English words for one in the original, as *opresse and overburthen* (70). Such bedizening of the Italian original is found also in Fairfax's rendering of the *Jerusalem Delivered*.

While many of the changes expand the text, there are some omissions, as at the end of chapter 19. The account of the death of "Remerus Orcus" (30) is abbreviated to the loss of its quality.

From the reproduction on the dust jacket of Alciati's emblematic picture of Chiron educating Achilles—in illustration of chapter 18—to the last note on the manuscript, the work of Mr Craig and of the Chapel Hill Press deserves praise.

ALLAN H. GILBERT

Duke University

Edward Bellamy. By ARTHUR E. MORGAN. New York: The Columbia University Press, 1944. Pp. xvii + 468. \$5.00.

Prior to the appearance of this volume, less perhaps was known about Edward Bellamy than about any other American writer of comparable stature. Curiosity about Bellamy was abundant, to be sure; and scholars were aware of the existence of manuscript materials which might possibly satisfy it. These unpublished materials, made available to Dr. Morgan and his assistants by the Bellamy family, have not only been employed in this biography, but have been made accessible to other students. "Both the original manuscripts and typed copies are in the Harvard College Library. Only typed copies are in the Library of Congress, the Huntington Library, and the Antioch College Library." (p. 421)

In the first half of the biography, especially, Dr. Morgan has in large part followed the excellent plan of allowing Bellamy to reveal himself in his own words—in passages quoted from his unpublished manuscripts. These quotations, in their immense range and significance, demonstrate what attentive readers of *Looking Backward* have long believed—that Bellamy had the intensity, originality, scope, and fineness of quality of a major creative artist. He had, too, the genius's knack of dealing with fundamental rather than with merely superficial questions. He lacked only energy. Of particular interest are certain quotations indicating a knowledge of Darwin and Taine, and others showing that Bellamy's interest in economic justice was of much more gradual development than has usually been supposed.

In addition to presenting the manysidedness of Bellamy, the biography opens other significant new ground, as, for instance, in its study of the little-known relationship between theosophy and the popularity of nationalism. And it is serviceable also in its renewal of emphasis on things already known, such as the strongly nativist strain in Bellamy's socialism. Few biographies, in short, have added more substantially to the sum of knowledge about their subjects.

Yet the net effect of Dr. Morgan's study is less satisfactory than the preceding sentence might suggest. The treatment of Bellamy's literary artistry is inadequate; that of his philosophy has appar-

ently suffered from the author's decision to publish Bellamy's philosophical writings in another volume. Other limitations of the book arise out of the fact that Dr. Morgan's special qualifications—those of the engineer and executive—are not such as to equip him fully for the task of historical investigation; and he has not always overcome the handicap of his amateur status. He has only the spottiest acquaintance with the considerable body of scholarly work recently done in the social criticism of the Gilded Age, and he appears to have misunderstood badly portions of one of the best of these studies, Robert L. Shurter's unpublished thesis, *The Utopian Novel in America, 1865-1900*. Dr. Shurter had made substantial beginnings in the study of the relation of *Looking Backward* to certain sources, particularly John Macnie's *The Diothas* and Laurence Gronlund's Marxian treatise, *The Coöperative Commonwealth*. Dr. Morgan, instead of following up these beginnings, has treated them merely as charges of plagiarism, has attempted to refute the case for Bellamy's indebtedness to Macnie, and has all but ignored Shurter's impressive list of verbal parallels between *Looking Backward* and *The Coöperative Commonwealth*. The charitable interpretation of this procedure is, of course, that, as an amateur in literary history, Dr. Morgan simply failed to see the bearing of Shurter's work (1) on the problem of the workings of creative talent, and possibly (2) on the interaction of native with foreign strains in the development of ideas in America. Dr. Morgan's treatment of Bellamy's relation to Marxian socialism is, in consequence, inconclusive and potentially misleading.

Such limitations point the need for further study of Bellamy and particularly of the Bellamy manuscripts. Although a most valuable study of Bellamy has now been made, the definitive study is still to seek.

WALTER FULLER TAYLOR

Mississippi College

The Crooked Rib. By FRANCIS LEE UTLEY. Columbus, Ohio: The Ohio State University, 1944. Pp. 368. (The Ohio State University Contributions in Languages and Literature, No. 10.)

Taking his title from the *Scholehouse* (c. 1541) attributed to Edward Gosynhill, Professor F. L. Utley in *The Crooked Rib* indexes 403 separate (chiefly verse) satires and defenses of women in English and Scots literature through 1568. Some tributary material on people unhappily married, step-mothers, and women's head-dresses (see *Surrey Arch. Soc.*, 1891) also filters into this bibliographical collection compounded mainly from other well-known manuals (the author reserves for later publication new

transcriptions of Nos. 2, 7, 13, 105), though nothing is anywhere said about the provocative Amazons described by Maundeville, the Lady Meed (but see No. 235) satirized in *Piers Plowman*, or Gower's pointed reference to the domination of Alice Perrers over Edward III. This study holds a wealth of detail, dispels false notions that the age was misogynous, and proves the least tedious to read of the many indexes for this period. The last is not due to the inclusion of any remarkable number of fresh data but rather to the clear, accurate, close marshalling of evidence. *The Crooked Rib* is not the history that Brantôme's *Les Dames* most monumentally is; however, Professor Utley's book is a seasoned, impartial, and not uninteresting treatise on the early arguments concerning women. Although drama is largely excluded, the selections from prose and poetry amply testify that the Middle Ages and the Renaissance had almost the identical lame answers about women that in many quarters are entertained today.

In an *Introduction* of some 97 pages Professor Utley sketches the background of the arguments: (1) the motive forces, (2) the genres, (3) the history of the satires and defenses. Continental literature, excluded by language from the *Analytical Index*, is here discussed; and many great authorities are quoted. Since minor Spanish poets are mentioned, the omission of Juan Ruiz's *El Libro de Buen Amor* is not easily understood. And against women, why omit the persistent poison-maid motif in the *Gesta Romanorum*? This learned study, at pains to trace in the past something for and something against women, demonstrates that these literary remains are mostly repetitious, conventional exercises. Yet the living description in *Paston Letters* of the treatment accorded young ladies should have been included. Moreover, as for alluding to actual people as birds (*re p. 42*, see *Les deux perroquets*: Bedier, p. 138), Wyclif reports a peer using a bird fable to describe his fellow-members at a parliament in 1371, and of course in the *Monk's Tale* Chaucer depicts the Count of Pisa's "litel children thre" as "brid-des for to putte in swich a cage!" In different connections: first, recently there seems to be a tendency to overestimate the influence of courtly love in mediaeval England, and thus it arrestingly figures little in these selections; secondly, as for Constantine's wife, or for ladies preferring inferior men (pp. 238, 246) there is an analogue in *Kathā Sarit Sāgara*, where an Oriental king's daughter refused for husband the God Indra only later to fall in love with a thief.

But these minutiae become irrelevant! The main point is that after some ten years of research Professor Utley has produced a firm contribution to the history of the affairs of women—a list as full as could be desired since the tide in women's affairs can lead, as Byron once said, "to God knows where."

HALDEEN BRADY

University of Kansas

Endymion in England: the literary history of a Greek myth. By EDWARD S. LE COMTE. New York: King's Crown Press, 1944. Pp. xiv + 189. \$2.25.

Among the pioneers in the study of classical mythology in English literature are Professors Charles G. Osgood, Robert K. Root, and their disciples of Princeton University. They have studied the sources and uses of various myths in Milton, Shakespeare, Spenser and Ben Jonson. Dr. Le Comte, taking a different tack, in his study, traces the fortunes of a single myth in antiquity and then in English literature, from the reign of Elizabeth through that of Victoria. By this method the author shows specifically the varied rhetorical and pictorial patterns and themes associated with the Endymion myth in English literature for more than 300 years.

From Platonic love in Drayton's *Endimion and Phoebe* to prostitution in Swift's "The Progress of Beauty" and to other satiric and burlesque conceptions in the neo-classical period, and then upward again to Keats's use of Endymion as a symbol of aspiration, the theme ranges. The last two chapters, concerned with the interpretations of the myth in the nineteenth century—with special attention to Keats—are probably the most interesting and significant. For Arthur Hugh Clough, Endymion illustrates the longing of the finite for the infinite; for Letitia Landon, the redeeming power of love; for Mathew Arnold, the isolation and loneliness of the modern man; for Ernest Dowson, mutability; for Keats, "the moon-lover, voyaging up and down the Platonic ladder of love and truth and beauty, has turned out to be an effective symbol of aspiration." These are among the variant themes and individual interpretations in the nineteenth century.

Chapter One is an excellent survey of the Endymion myth in antiquity. The author notes the allusions in Hesiod, Apollonius Rhodius, Lucian, Aristotle, Cicero, and the scholiasts. He is aware also of the reference books of the Renaissance through which ancient myth and legend were disseminated. Some of these—which made the classical versions of myths easily accessible to writers of the sixteenth century—the author might profitably have consulted. Charles Stephanus' *Dictionarium*, for example, has a compact account of Endymion with references to Pliny and Apollonius. The proverb "Endymionis somnum dormire," quoted by Stephanus, is expounded by Erasmus in the *Adagia* (II, 357D) with references to Aristotle and Cicero. Cartari, *Imagines Deorum* (1581), has a long account of Diana with space devoted to Endymion and with a most interesting illustrative woodcut. Valerianus, *Hieroglyphica* (1556, I, 627B), presents the sleep of Endymion as a symbol of the death of the pious man, Endymion as the soul, and Diana as the queen of heaven. From these books authors of the sixteenth and seventeenth century could have learned all that they needed to know about the Endymion myth.

The several illuminating references to Endymion in painting and sculpture make us wish that the author (beyond his declared aim) could have devoted more space to the myth in art, such as Guercino's painting of the Sleeping Endymion, Caracci's fresco of Diana embracing Endymion, Bartolozzi's engraving of Diana and Endymion, etc.

Though there are many references to the myth in foreign literatures, this is not a study in comparative literature. It exhibits however, tremendous industry in combing the English poets, great and small, for allusions and references, and in showing the persistence of the myth with its variant interpretations through three centuries of English literature. It is thus a study, wide in range and rich in implications and suggestions for students of literary history.

D. T. STARNES

University of Texas

Ernest Dowson. By MARK LONGAKER. Philadelphia: The University of Pennsylvania Press. 1944. Pp. xii + 282. \$4.00.

This is a solid and thoroughly scholarly biography of the poet who perhaps best represented what the yellow 90's wished to be. Mr. Longaker has taken pains, and, judging from his success, exercised great tact, to acquire all the information about Dowson that is still available. For this we owe him a debt of gratitude, since the study of the 90's has hardly got beyond the stage of memoirs, "impressions," and that popular kind of social history which is more calculated to entertain than to inform or evaluate; solid books about the period are badly needed.

The evidence about Dowson is all here. We can now judge with reasonable accuracy the extent to which he was a drug addict (not at all; absinthe was his narcotic when, toward the end, he took to such things), the effect on him of Missie's marriage (insignificant in itself; even in the long run the affair with Missie was rather a subsidiary than a central cause of his break-up), the extent to which he represented a new and melodramatic type of personality with what everyone from Hardy on down was describing as a "universal wish not to live" (very small; Bohemia, bad teeth, tuberculosis and a temperamental indecisiveness are more than enough to explain what happened).

Mr. Longaker has deliberately made no effort to place Dowson in his period or to deal with his poetry, except in the most elementary biographical way. This is a real limitation. Not to center a poet's biography in his poetry is not only to neglect the most important thing about him but to throw the biography itself out of focus, particularly when the poet lived in the 90's, when Wilde's doctrine that

life imitates art was something more than an epigram. There are two obvious strains in Dowson's poetry, both inherited from the romantics. These are a sentimental attachment to innocence, particularly in melodramatic juxtaposition with luscious vice ("But when the feast is finished and the lamps expire, / Then falls thy shadow, Cynara! the night is thine"); and the sensuous pursuit of death ("Cease smiling, Dear" is a jigsaw puzzle of Keats' quotations on the subject). The Dowson who brought Marie around to Poland to spend evenings with Missie and Madame and could never really make up his mind to marry Missie is separated from the author of "Cynara" and the "Sonnets of a Little Girl" only by that fog of daydream rhetoric which had been rolling in all through the century; and there is no doubt that, if there intervened between the "days of wine and roses" and the "pass[ing of] the gate" a period of dirtiness and toothlessness and disease, Dowson was supported to the end by the conviction, so often expressed in his verse, that the disaster to which he contributed so much was in the nature of the well lived life.

If the style in rhetoric has changed a good deal since the 90's, the style in feeling has not. Not to see through the rhetoric to the poses which the 90's lived is to miss a good deal of what makes our poets and their poetry what they are today. It is also to leave Dowson's poetry merely something politely called "lyric beauty," that is to say, rhetoric.

ARTHUR MIZENER

Wells College.

Peter Markoe (1752?-1792): A Philadelphia Writer. By Sister MARY CHRYSOSTOM DIEBELS, S. S. N. D., Washington, D. C.: The Catholic University of America Press, 1944. Pp. x + 116.

Sister Mary's dissertation is not a biography of Peter Markoe, although she sketches in the known facts of his life. It is an objective and detailed examination of two plays, one epistolary prose satire, and twenty-five poems which Markoe published in the unsettled years of 1784 to 1790. Her purpose is two-fold: to determine Markoe's significance as author; and to ascertain to what extent his work represents the America of the late eighteenth century. The volume contains an Appendix in which she attempts to identify obscure allusions in Markoe's poem, "The Times," to which he left no key. There is also an extensive Bibliography.

Of the two plays, *The Reconciliation; or The Triumph of Nature: A Comic Opera, in Two Acts* (1790) is an adaptation of a translation, now lost, of Salomon Gessner's *Ernst*. It is important only as an example of German literary influence and as one of the "earliest comic operas written in America by an American" (p.

48), antedating the work of Dunlap. *The Patriot Chief: A Tragedy* (1784) is a neo-classical tragedy on a political theme, with an undercurrent of American political propaganda of an anti-aristocratic nature. It is imitative, conventional, and readable.

The epistolary prose satire, *The Algerine Spy in Pennsylvania or, Letters Written by a Native of Algiers on the Affairs of the United States in America* (1787), resembles Goldsmith's *The Citizen of the World*. It "seems to be the first example in American literature of a discussion of national affairs built upon a foundation of pure fiction." It lies "midway between Hopkinson's *Pretty Story* (1774) with its suggestion of fiction, and Brackenridge's *Modern Chivalry* (1792-1815), the first political novel in America" (p. 65). It demonstrates the superior merits of a society which can convert an unwilling Mohammedan to Christianity and democracy.

Both the tragedy and the prose make better reading today than the verse satire, the best known of which is "The Times" (1787-1788). This poem belittles many a political and social contemporary, only a few of whom it is now possible to identify with certainty. It expresses Markoe's opposition to the adoption of the Federal Constitution. It is of uneven power. The best of its satire is "indignant rather than sympathetic, condemnatory rather than congenial, Juvenalian rather than Horatian" (p. 86).

This book is an avowed niche-filler and as such is admirable. There are typographical errors in the quoted passages which could have been avoided by the substitution of photostats as copy. On page 102 the author of *The Shipwreck* should be William Falconer, instead of Thomas. The text throughout is carefully documented.

LOUIE M. MINER

Brooklyn College

BRIEF MENTION

La Jeune Indienne, Comédie en un acte et en vers. Par CHAMFORT. Avec une introduction par GILBERT CHINARD. Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1945. Pp. 80. \$2.00. Chamfort's "bluette" of 1764 has historical interest in that it is the first French play to introduce a Quaker into its cast and to have its scene laid in one of the English colonies that became the United States. It is an example in miniature of a *drame bourgeois* that shows the author's interest in moralizing and in two of M. Chinard's specialties, the exotic and the primitive. The editor has connected it with the theme of Inkle and Yarico, reproducing in appendices the versions of Ligon, Steele, and Raynal. He has made accessible in an attractive form a text that was not readily in reach,

despite the fact that a good many editions of it were published in the eighteenth and nineteenth centuries.

In publishing the text of 1764 M. C. explains that he kept the original punctuation and capitalization because in the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries capitals were used to lend dignity or emphasis, punctuation to indicate "des pauses et des nuances de diction." I have much sympathy with this point of view except when the punctuation is so extraordinary that to preserve it would mislead the reader, but I would retain capitals and punctuation to lend a savor of the past rather than as a guide to understanding an author, for the use of capitals was most inconsistent and may, as well as punctuation, be due to faulty printing. What meaning, for instance, can be given to the fact that on p. 45 *père* is written with a capital in "Précieux à mon Pere," but with a small letter in "de me rendre à mon pere"? And what "nuance de diction" lies in the facts that on p. 70 a speech ends with a comma, on p. 72 with a colon? These last I should interpret as misprints, for eighteenth-century printers were no more accurate than they are today, when it is possible to publish "n'est connu" (p. 58) for "m'est connu"; "font" (p. 64) for "sont"; and "Que dit-elle?" (p. 70, line 4) for "Quiconque, en recevant des dons." Except to establish the fallibility of printing and of proof-correcting, such slips, are, however, of little importance when one takes into consideration the taste displayed in the presentation of the volume and the learning evidenced in the introduction.

H. CARRINGTON LANCASTER

A Romantic View of Poetry. By JOSEPH WARREN BEACH. Minneapolis: The University of Minnesota Press, 1944. Pp. iv + 133. \$2.00. These lectures propose the generalization that "poetry is the sovereign means of realizing the satisfaction we take in living," and then explore this view under several headings. Concrete words realize the satisfaction of "sensory appeal on the level of primary physical experience." Epic and much lyric poetry is a process of "restatement, or recapitulation, of what has been satisfying in itself." The motivation for most poetry is "the need to realize or discharge emotions." Finally, "the divisions or contradictions of the mind" also "have their contribution to make to the satisfaction taken in poetic art."

All these very general propositions are in some sense undoubtedly true. They are among the commonplaces of criticism, however, and in some cases, seem only remotely pertinent to the poems quoted as examples. Moreover, the logic of Professor Beach's lectures is perplexing. It is not clear why just these few aspects of poetry should

have been chosen for investigation, or what the relevance is of the digressions on, for example, the theory of language, the conflicting schools of psychology, the "new humanism," or the problem of free will and determinism.

Despite its formal arrangement, however, it is probably a mistake to judge this work primarily as critical theory. Taken as a frankly discursive appreciation of some nineteenth century poetry, the book is extremely readable. On a number of individual poems Professor Beach's comments are both penetrating and witty. He gives a convincing exposition of the ethical pattern of the romantic morality play, "Prometheus Unbound." In particular, his analysis of "Don Juan" as "a perpetual counterpoint of romanticism and cynicism, of high and low," and of Keats' "Ode to Melancholy" as an almost Donne-like poem of wit and paradox may reshape for many of us the experience of reading these poems.

M. H. ABRAMS

Harvard University

CORRESPONDENCE

ZU OSKAR SEIDLINS "DAS ETWAS UND DAS NICHTS." Seidlins Interpretation der Fauststelle Vers 1335 fg. (*Germanic Review*, XIX, 3, S. 170 fg.) wird am stärksten gestützt durch seine Beobachtung, daß Mephisto den Gedankengang Fausts, der sich eng an das Johannesevangelium anschließt, parodiert und der göttlichen Schöpfungslehre Johannis eine parallele Satanologie gegenüberstellt.

Es tritt aber außerdem noch ein anderer Parallelismus hinzu, der übrigens auch noch nie bemerkt zu sein scheint und dem Argument Seidlins weiteres Gewicht verleiht. Wenn Faust nämlich in der Bibelübersetzung *Logos* zuerst als *Wort*, dann als *Sinn* und *Kraft* und endlich als *Tat* verdeutscht, so durchschreitet seinerseits nun Mephisto dieselbe Stufenfolge in seiner Selbstdefinition. Faust fragt ihn nach seinem Namen und Mephisto, statt darauf zu antworten, suggeriert ihm, da er doch das *Wort* so sehr verachte, die Frage nach seinem Wesen (= *Sinn*). Als Faust darauf eingeht, obwohl der Sinn aus dem Namen zu lesen sei (Verderber und Lügegeist) und diesen mit "wer bist du denn" dennoch verlangt, antwortet Mephisto sofort mit *Kraft* und *Tat* ("Ein Teil von jener *Kraft*, Die stets das Böse will und stets das Gute schafft"), womit denn die Gelegenheit gegeben ist, sich über Mephistos Taten im folgenden weiter zu unterhalten.

ERNST FEISE

Im Juni-Heft 1941 der *MLN* hat Walter A. Reichart für den sonderbaren Titel einer verschollenen Jugendarbeit Gerhart Hauptmanns aus dem Jahre 1888 (*Solange Gott nimmt, nehm' ich auch*) eine überraschende Erklärung beigebracht. Danach handelt es sich nicht etwa, wie man vermutet hatte, um ein soziales Thema, sondern um den trotzig-launigen Ausspruch eines Witwers, der sich nach dem Verlust mehrerer Frauen noch einmal verheiraten will. Die Richtigkeit dieser Deutung hat Hauptmann selbst aus der Erinnerung bestätigt. Wenn nun aber Reichart annimmt, dass Hauptmann die Anregung zu seiner kleinen Humoreske durch Theodor Fontanes einige Jahre vorher erschienene Novelle *Unterm Birnbaum* erhalten habe, worin der Ausspruch in ähnlicher Fassung ("Nimmt Gott, so nehm' ich wieder") einem alten, viermal verwitweten Hauptmann von Rohr zugeschrieben wird, so scheint mir das nicht zuzutreffen. Die Geschichte ist nämlich nicht etwa von Fontane erfunden; er selber tischt sie ja als eine bekannte Anekdote auf. Dass es sich wirklich um eine solche handelt, geht daraus hervor, dass schon Jeremias Gotthelf einmal darauf anspielt. Im 13. Kapitel seines Romans *Zeitgeist und Bernergeist* ist davon die Rede, dass der Hunghans, wenn seine Frau sterben sollte, gewiss bald eine andere nehmen werde, denn "solange Gott nehme, nehme er auch." (Bd. 13 der Züricher Gesamtausgabe, S. 227.) Der Wortlaut deckt sich hier also genau mit dem Hauptmannschen, und wenn man eine direkte "Quelle" für diesen annehmen wollte, müsste man sie bei Gotthelf suchen, wobei man noch darauf hinweisen könnte, dass sich Hauptmann zur Zeit der Abfassung der Humoreske in Zürich befand, und dass sich der angehende Naturalist wohl zu dem grossen Schweizer Realisten hingezogen fühlen mochte. Dennoch möchte ich nicht behaupten, dass die Anregung von Gotthelf stammt; dazu ist die Erwähnung in *Zeitgeist und Bernergeist* wohl zu flüchtig und beiläufig. Auch Gotthelf scheint ja den Ausspruch schon als bekannt vorauszusetzen. Ich möchte annehmen, dass es sich um eine in der Schweiz oder Deutschland umlaufende Anekdote handelt, die vielleicht ursprünglich einmal in irgend einem Volkskalender gestanden hat. Ob der "Held" der Geschichte wirklich ein Hauptmann von Rohr war, wie Fontane angibt, ist wohl auch zweifelhaft. Vermutlich hat Fontane den Namen nur erfunden, um der Geschichte mehr Relief zu geben, wobei er wohl an seine alte Freundin Mathilde von Rohr dachte, die eine passionierte Anekdoten-erzählerin war und ihm den Stoff zu manchen seiner Geschichten geliefert hat, z. B. zu *Schach von Wuthenow*.

EDUARD BEREND

Geneva

NECROLOGY

BERT JOHN VOS

BERT JOHN Vos died at his home in Tucson, Arizona, on March 28. Born at Katwyk aan Zee, The Netherlands, on October 27, 1867, he came to this country as a child, his family settling at Grand Rapids, Michigan. He got his undergraduate training at the University of Michigan, where Calvin Thomas was his teacher. In 1888 he came to the Johns Hopkins University as a graduate student, under Henry Wood in German, and Basil Gildersleeve in Greek. After a further year at Leipzig, he took his Ph. D. in German at the Johns Hopkins in 1892. After teaching one year at the newly founded University of Chicago, he was called back to the Johns Hopkins in 1893 as Associate, and then Associate Professor of German. From 1908 to his retirement in 1937 he was Head of the German department of the University of Indiana. From 1913 to 1915 he was Co-Editor of MODERN LANGUAGE NOTES. From 1917-1918, and again from 1924 to 1925, he was President of the Association of Modern Language Teachers of the Central West and South; he was Chairman of the Western Section of the Modern Language Association 1917-20, and Vice-President of the Modern Language Association, 1926-27.

From his earliest years, Vos's interest was directed largely upon Old High German and Middle High German topics: his *Diction and Rime-Technic of Hartman von Aue* (1896) is still cited as an authority. He prepared a number of school editions of modern German authors, e. g. Grimm's *Kinder- und Hausmärchen*; Heine's *Harzreise*, Schiller's *Wilhelm Tell*. Also these editions he grounded on thorough research: before publishing the *Kinder- und Hausmärchen*, for example, he insisted upon comparing the exceedingly rare first edition, inaccessible in this country, which was generously loaned by the Royal Library of Munich. Vos's greatest success was his *Essentials of German* (1903) which saw numerous editions, with a sale of several hundred thousand copies.

Vos had a keen eye for recognizing the abilities of his students and assistants, and was never jealous of their success. His old students, of whom the writer was one, always found in him an unselfish adviser and a devoted friend.

W. K.

RECENT PUBLICATIONS

ENGLISH

[The *English* list includes only books received.]

Craig, Hardin.—Literary study and the scholarly profession. *Seattle*: U. of Washington Press, 1944. Pp. xvi + 150. \$2.25.

Earnest, Ernest.—A foreword to literature. *New York*: Appleton-Century, 1945. Pp. viii + 332.

Hood, Thomas.—Letters, ed. Leslie A. Marchand. *New Brunswick*: Rutgers U. Press, 1945. Pp. viii + 104. \$2.00.

Smither, Nelle.—A history of the English theatre at New Orleans, 1806-1842. *Philadelphia*: U. of Pennsylvania, 1944. Pp. x + 49. (Essential Portion of a Dissertation.)

Sutherland, James.—English in the universities, an inaugural lecture. *Cambridge, England*: University Press [New York: Macmillan], 1945. Pp. 30.

Trueblood, Paul Graham.—The flowering of Byron's genius, studies in Byron's *Don Juan*. *Stanford U.*: Stanford U. Press, 1945. Pp. xii + 183. \$2.50.

GERMAN

Geissendoerfer, Theodore, and Kurtz, John W.—Deutsche Meisternovellen. Revised Edition. *New York*: Prentice-Hall, 1945. iv, 353 pp. \$3.00.

Roth, Francis, O. S. A.—Pater Abraham a Sancta Clara 1644-1709. [Reprinted from *Monatshefte für Deutschen Unterricht*, Vol. XXXVI, Oct. 1944]. 16 pp.

Society for the History of the Germans in Maryland. Twenty-sixth Report. *Baltimore, Md.*: 1945. 56 pp.

FRENCH

Alamo, Juan del.—Historia de la Literatura francesa. T. II. *Madrid*: Suc. S. de Ocaña, 1944. 310 pp.

Berne-Jouffroy.—Présence de Valéry. *Paris*: Plon, 1944. 238 pp.

Breton, André.—Arcane 17. *New York*: Brentano's, 1945. 176 pp. \$1.50.

Chinard, G.—When the French Came to California, a tr. by Désiré Fricot of Trény's *La Calif. dévoilée*. *San Francisco*: Calif. Hist. Soc., 1944. 56 pp. \$1.00.

Daudon, René.—French in Review. *New York*: Harcourt, Brace, 1945. viii + 267 pp. \$1.60.

De Jongh, W. F. J.—Bibliography of the Novel and Short Story in French from the beginning of printing till 1600. *Albuquerque*: U. of N. Mex., 1944. 144 pp. \$0.79.

Dorval, Marcelle.—Le cœur sur la main: expressions idiomatiques françaises et américaines. *New York*: Brentano's, 1944. vii + 152 pp. \$2.00.

Dumesnil, R.—Gustave Flaubert. *Paris*: Desclée et Brouwer, 1945. 538 pp.

Fernandez, Ramon.—Itinéraire français [Sainte-Beuve, Péguy etc.]. *Paris*: Eds. du Pavois, 1943. 480 pp.

Ghéon, Henri.—L'Art du théâtre. *Montreal*: Ed. Serge, 1944. 218 pp.

Haedens, Kléber.—Une Histoire de la litt. fr. *Paris*: Julliard, 1944. 500 pp.

Hooke, M. K. and M. H. Miller.—French Review Grammar. *New York*: Holt, 1945. ix + 262 + xliii pp. \$1.75.

Klinck, G. A.—Allons gai! a topical anthology of French Canadian prose and verse. *Toronto*: Ryerson, 1945. x + 154 pp. \$0.90.

Kuehner, Paul.—Theories on the Origin and Formation of Language in the Eighteenth Century in France. U. of Pa. diss., 1944. viii + 54 pp.

Loughrey, Mary E.—France and Rhode Island, 1686-1800. *New York*: Columbia U. Press, 1944. vii + 186 pp. \$2.25.

Maupassant.—Best Short Stories; introd. by Arthur Symons. *New York*: World pub., 1944. xi + 305 pp. \$0.49.

Mauriac, Pierre.—Claude Bernard. *Paris*: Grasset, 1941. vii + 157 pp.

Micaud, C. A.—L'Armée moderne. *Boston*: Heath, 1944. viii + 142 pp. \$1.00.

Mireaux, Emile.—La Chanson de Roland et l'histoire de France. *Paris*: A. Michel, 1943. vii + 300 pp.

Mornet, Daniel.—Jean Racine. *Paris*: Aux Armes de France, 1944. 224 pp.

Nasatir, A. P.—French Activities in California. *Palo Alto*: Stanford U. Press, 1945. xiii + 559 pp. \$10.00.

Oda, W. H.—The Subject of Realism in the *Revue de Paris* (1829-58). U. of Pa. diss., 1943. 94 pp.

Pei, M. A.—French. *New York*: Vanni, 1944. 42 pp. \$0.65.

Picard, Roger.—Le Romantisme social. *New York*: Brentano's, 1944. 438 pp.

Prévost, Jean (ed.).—Problème du roman. *Lyons*: Confluences, 1943. 412 pp.

Sauzé, E. B. de.—Using French. A Workbook. *New York*: Holt, 1945. vi + 101 pp.

Spink, G. W.—En voyage avec Jacques Lenormand. *London*: Harrap, 1944. 104 pp. 2 s.

ITALIAN

Alfieri, Vittorio.—Del principe e delle lettere. A cura di Luigi Russo. *Firenze*: Le Monnier, 1943. 423 pp. L. 24.

Alighieri, Dante.—De Monarchia. Tradotta in lingua toscana da Marsilio Ficino. *Roma*: Ed. Giovanissima, 1943. 57 pp. L. 20.

Annali manzoniani. A cura del centro nazionale di studi manzoniani. Vol. III. *Milano*: Casa del Manzoni, 1942. 348 pp. L. 70.

Apollonio, Mario.—Uomini e forme nella cultura italiana delle origini. Storia letteraria del Duecento. 2a ediz. accresciuta. *Firenze*: Sansoni, 1943. xix + 383 pp. L. 80.

Arcari, Paolo.—Giosuè Carducci. *Milano*: Zucchi, 1942. 195 pp.

Aretino, Pietro.—Piacevoli e capricciosi ragionamenti. A cura di Antonio Piccone Stella. *Milano*: Bompiani, 1943. 381 pp. L. 50.

Ariosto, Ludovico.—Orlando furioso. Ediz. integra. Introd., testo, argomenti, indice, a cura di N. Zingarelli. 4a ediz. accresciuta. *Milano*: Hoepli, 1943. lxxv + 600 pp. L. 60.

Battisti, Carlo; Lauro Gori; Anna Maria Piacenti.—I nomi locali del Basso Isarco. Parte III: Dal rivo di Gardena alla Bria. *Firenze*: Rinascimento del libro, 1943. 416 pp. L. 180.

Bertoldi, Vittorio.—Glottologia. Principi, problemi, metodi. *Napoli*: stab. tip. editoriale, 1942. 160 pp. L. 40.

Bianchi, Dante.—Meditazioni intorno al Boccaccio. *Firenze*: Tipocalcografia classica, 1942. 149 pp.

Boccaccio, Giovanni.—Il Decameron. 70 novelle con la "cornice" dell'Opera. Testo e commento a cura di Mario Bonfantini. *Milano*: Garzanti, 1942. 721 pp.

Bonvesin de la Riva. Vita scolastica. A cura di Ezio Franceschini. *Padova*: Gregoriana, 1943. xvii + 44. L. 20.

Bosco, Umberto.—Aspetti del romanticismo italiano. *Roma*: Ed. cremonese, 1942. 207 pp. L. 25.

—Tre letture dantesche. *Roma*: Ediz. italiane, 1942. 77 pp. L. 12.

Braccesi, Roberto.—Storia degli inni sacri di Alessandro Manzoni. *Urbino*: Argalia, 1942. 123 pp. L. 6.

Branca, Vittore (ed.).—Rimatori del dolce stil nuovo. *Roma*: Albrighi, Segati e C., 1941. 152 pp.

Bruers, Antonio.—Saggi sulla letteratura italiana e straniera. *Bologna*: Zanichelli, 1943. 207 pp. L. 20.

Buonaiuti, Ernesto.—Storia del cristiane-

simo. Vol. II: Evo Medio. *Milano*: Corbaccio, 1943. 738 pp. L. 80.

Cabibbe, Giorgio.—Antonio Fogazzaro nel giudizio della critica a cent'anni dalla nascita. Saggio critico con una guida analitica degli scritti apparsi su giornali e riviste nella ricorrenza del centenario. *Milano*: Ist. d'alta cultura (tip. Bestetti), 1943. 39 pp.

Cagliaritano, Ubaldo.—Bernardino degli Albizzeschi, apostolo senese del Quattrocento. *Siena*: Tip. ex-Cooperativa, 1943. xiv + 299 pp. L. 25.

Calcaterra, Carlo.—Le adunanze della "Patria Società Letteraria." *Torino*: Soc. ed. Internazionale, 1943. 414 pp.

Camilli, Amerindo.—Pronuncia e grafia dell'italiano. *Firenze*: Sansoni, 1941. 105 pp. L. 12.

Cammelli, Giuseppe.—I dotti bizantini e le origini dell'Umanesimo. Vol. II: Giovanni Argiropulo. *Firenze*: Le Monnier, 1941. 223 pp. L. 35.

Cesarotti, Melchior.—Saggio sulla filosofia delle lingue. A cura di Raffaele Spongano. *Firenze*: Sansoni, 1943. 159 pp.

Commemorazione di Michele Barbi. A cura della R. Scuola Normale di Pisa. Con ritratto e con la bibliografia degli scritti. *Firenze*: Sansoni, 1943. 71 pp. con ritratto.

Croce, Benedetto.—Pensieri vari. *Bari*: Laterza, 1943. 49 pp. L. 12.

Damerini, Gino.—D'Annunzio a Venezia. *Milano*: Mondadori, 1943. 307 pp. L. 40.

De Sanctis, Giambattista.—Il V del Purgatorio: Il canto di Pia. *Città di Castello: il Solco*, 1942. 48 pp. L. 4.50.

Di Silvestro, Yolanda Eleanor.—La Vita e i romanzi di Grazia Deledda. (University of Penna. dissertation). *Philadelphia*: 1945. xi + 185 pp.

Falqui, Enrico.—Antologia della prosa scientifica italiana del Seicento. A cura di E. F. *Firenze*: Vallecchi, 1943. 839 pp. con 46 tavole.

Favaro, Antonio.—Bibliografia galileiana. *Venezia*: Ist. veneto di scienze, lettere ed arti, 1942. v + 39 pp.

Ferri, Aristide.—Studi manzoniani. *Ancona*: Fogola, 1942. 352 pp. L. 20.

Firenzuola, Agnolo.—Le novelle. A cura di Adriano Seroni. *Milano*: Bompiani, 1943. xix + 151 pp. L. 20.

Flora, Francesco.—La poesia ermetica. 2a ediz. *Bari*: Laterza, 1942. 212 pp. L. 22.

—Taverna del Parnaso. Saggi letterari. Serie I. *Roma*: Ist. romano d'arti grafiche Tumminelli, 1943. 270 pp. L. 30.

Fontana, Lorenzo.—Vincenzo Monti prosatore e retore. *Roma*: Albrighi, Segati e C., 1943. 177 pp. L. 18.

Franceschini, Ezio (ed.).—*Sanctae Catharinae senensis legenda minor*. Milano: Bocca, 1942. x + 204 pp. L. 50.

Fubini, Mario. — *La lingua del Vico*. Firenze: La Nuova Italia, 1943. 47 pp. L. 15.

Galilei, Galileo.—*Scritti letterari*. A cura di Alberto Chiari. Firenze: Le Monnier, 1943. xxii + 407 pp. L. 35.

Giovine, M. V.—*Galilei scrittore*. Roma: Albrighi Segati e C., 1943. 170 pp. L. 15.

Goldoni, Carlo.—*Tutte le opere di C. G. a cura di Giuseppe Ortolani*. Milano: Mondadori, 1943. 1333 pp. L. 140.

Gozzi, Gaspare.—*Gazzetta veneta*. Voll. I, II. A cura di Bruno Romani. Milano: Bompiani, 1943. 265; 255 pp. L. 20 cad.

Grabher, Carlo.—*Il canto V del Purgatorio letto da C. G. nella sala della Biblioteca Classense di Ravenna*. Firenze: Sansoni, 1942. 33 pp. L. 5.

Isopescu, Claudio. — *Saggi romeno-italo-ispatici*. Roma: Signorelli, 1943. 311 pp. L. 20.

Laude drammatiche e rappresentazioni sacre. A cura di Vincenzo De Bartholomeis. 3 vols. Firenze: Le Monnier, 1943. xx + 473; 422; 430. L. 35; 30; 35.

Machiavelli, Niccolò. — *La mandragola*. Clizia. Belfagor. A cura di Luigi Russo. Firenze: Sansoni, 1943. 164 pp.

Manzoni, A. — *I promessi sposi e Storia della colonna infame*. A cura di M. Barbi e F. Ghisalberti. Milano: Casa del Manzoni; Firenze: Sansoni, 1942. 585 pp. con due ritratti.

Medici, Lorenzo de'.—*Poemeti*, a cura di Emilio Cecchi. Torino: Einaudi, 1943. L. 12.

Metalaga, Marina e Enzo Vialardi. — *Vocabolario engadinese-italiano*. Milano: E. Padoan, 1943. 178 pp. L. 55.

Metastasio, Pietro. — *Tutte le opere*. A cura di Bruno Brunelli. Vol. I. Milano: Mondadori, 1943. xlix + 1512. L. 125.

Migliorini, Bruno.—*Lingua contemporanea*. 3a ediz. riveduta e aumentata. Firenze: Sansoni, 1943. 247 pp. L. 20.

— *Saggi sulla lingua del Novecento*. 2a ediz. Firenze: Sansoni, 1942. 257 pp. L. 20.

Monteverdi, Angelo. — *Antiquitates romanicae*. Raccolta di testi per un corso di filologia romanza. Milano: Montuoro, 1942. 61 pp. L. 28.

Natali, Giulio.—*Viaggio col Leopardi nell'Italia letteraria*. Milano: Montuoro, 1943. 262 pp.

Pacetti, Dionisio.—*Le prediche autografe di S. Giacomo della Marca (1393-1476) con un saggio delle medesime*. Ad Claras aquas (*Quaracchi*): Typ. Collegii S. Bonaventurae, 1943. 55 pp.

Pagani, Severino.—*I proverbi milanesi raccolti e annotati da S. P. coll'aggiunta dei più caratteristici modi di dire del dialetto milanese*. Milano: Ceschina, 1942. 960 pp. L. 100.

Panzini, Alfredo. — *Dizionario moderno delle parole che non si trovano nei dizionari comuni*. 8a ediz. postuma a cura di Alfredo Schiaffini e Bruno Migliorini. Con un'appendice di cinquemila voci e gli elenchi dei forestierismi banditi dalla R. Accademia d'Italia. Milano: Hoepli, 1942. x + 895 pp. L. 150.

Peritore, Giuseppe Angelo.—*La poesia di Giovanni Pascoli*. Saggio critico. Modena: Soc. tip. modenese, 1942. 132 pp. L. 30.

Petrarca, Francesco. — *Il mio segreto*. Traduzione e nota di Enrico Carrara. Firenze: Sansoni, 1943. 139 pp.

Pietrobono, Luigi.—*Commento alla "Divina Commedia" illustrata da G. B. Galizzi*. Milano: ed. Labor, 1943. 138 pp.

Ridolfi, Roberto.—*Opuscoli di storia letteraria e di erudizione: Savonarola, Machiavelli, Guicciardini, Giannotti*. Firenze: Bibliopolis, 1942. vii + 220 con cinque tavole. L. 80.

Robertazzi, Mario.—*Scrittori italiani contemporanei*. Saggi. Milano: Leonardo, 1942. 209 pp. L. 17.

Russo, Luigi.—*La critica letteraria contemporanea*. Vol. I. Bari: Laterza, 1942. 288 pp. L. 30.

— *La critica letteraria contemporanea*. Vol. III: *Dal Serra agli ermetici*. Bari: Laterza, 1943. 400 pp. L. 45.

Salimbene, Fra S. da Parma. — *Cronica*. A cura di Ferdinando Bernini. Bari: Laterza, 1942. 2 vols. 522; 537 pp. L. 200 compless. (Scrittori d'Italia, 187).

Sansone, Mario (ed.).—*Favolisti del Settecento*. Firenze: Sansoni, 1943. 135 pp.

— *La poesia giovanile di Alessandro Manzoni*. Messina: Principato, 1941. 86 pp. L. 8.

Santucci, Luigi. — *Folgore da San Gimignano*. Firenze: Sansoni, 1942. 103 pp. L. 12.

Sassetti, Filippo.—*Lettere indiane*. A cura di Arrigo Benedetti. Torino: Einaudi, 1942. 220 pp. L. 12.

Sbarra, Attilio.—*L'arte di Giuseppe Parrini*. Napoli: Ed. dell'Aquila bianca, 1942. 197 pp. L. 15.

Scardamaglia, Edoardo.—*Biblioteche d'Italia*. Roma: Ist. naz. per le relazioni culturali con l'estero, 1942. 34 pp.

Scialdoni, Luigi. — *Alessandro Manzoni*. Milano: Zucchi, 1942. 100 pp. L. 10.

Solmi, Sergio.—*La salute di Montaigne e*

altri scritti di letteratura francese. *Firenze*: Le Monnier, 1942. xvi + 191. L. 24.

Sorbelli, Albano. — Inventari dei manoscritti delle biblioteche d'Italia. Vol. LXXIV: Trento. *Firenze*: Bibliopolis, 1942. 195 pp. L. 100.

Sorrento, Luigi. — Problemi linguistici e culturali sulla diffusione della lingua italiana nelle varie regioni d'Italia durante i primi secoli della letteratura. Parte I. *Milano*: Libreria scientifico-universitaria, 1942. 79 pp.

Storia illustrata della letteratura italiana scritta da un gruppo di studiosi. Vol. I: [scritti di Schinetti, Torraca, Bertoni, Chiari, Salvatorelli, Sapegno, Neri, Casella, e altri]. *Milano*: Garzanti, 1942. 383 pp.

Studi danteschi, diretti da Michele Barbi. Vol. XXVI. *Firenze*: Sansoni, 1942. 211 pp. L. 30.

Studi romanzi, fondati da Ernesto Monaci, editi a cura di Angelo Monteverdi e Mario Pelaez. Vol. XXX. *Roma*: Tip. Cuggiani, 1943. 227 pp. L. 60.

Studi su Dante nel Risorgimento. [Scritti di Mazzoni, Galletti, Sticco, Chiari e altri]. *Milano*: Hoepli, 1941. xv + 298. L. 22.

Susini, Giuseppe. — Ragionamenti sulla poesia. *Modena*: Guanda, 1942. 371 pp. L. 20.

Toffanin, Giuseppe. — Il secolo senza Roma. (Il Rinascimento del secolo XIII). *Bologna*: Zanichelli, 1943. 179 pp. L. 20.

Tolomei, Ugo. — Letteratura. (Saggi). *Firenze*: La Nuova Italia, 1942. 286 pp. L. 30.

Ugolini, Francesco A. — Atalante paleografico romanzo a cura di F. A. U. Fasc. I: Documenti volgari italiani. *Torino*: La stampa, 1942. 8 p. con 26 tavole. L. 26.

Valgimigli, Manara. — Uomini e scrittori del mio tempo. *Firenze*: Sansoni, 1943. 339 pp. L. 35.

Valli, Francesco. — Saggi sulla letteratura religiosa italiana del Trecento. *Urbino*: Argalia, 1943. 171 pp. L. 40.

Vitali, Guido (ed.). — Paolo Sarpi e Traiano Boccalini. *Milano*: Vallardi, 1942. 116 pp.

Zambarelli, Luigi. — L'imitazione dantesca del Dittamondo e nelle liriche morali di Fazio degli Uberti. *Roma*: Atena, 1942. 107 pp. L. 20.

SPANISH

Alonso, Dámaso. — Ensayos sobre Poesía española. *Madrid*: Revista de Occidente, 1944. 401 pp.

Antología Poética Moderna, ed. Agustín del Saz. *Barcelona*: Barna, 1944. 226 pp.

Bertini, Giovanni Maria. — Studi e ricerche ispaniche. *Milano*: Soc. ed. Vita e Pensiero, 1942. 151 pp. L. 18.

Cantar de Mio Cid, ed. Menéndez Pidal. Primera Parte. *Madrid*: Espasa-Calpe, 1944. xiii + 420 pp.

Ciattino, Orestes. — El idioma desafiado. *Buenos Aires*: Ed. del autor, 1944. 101 pp.

Farías, Javier. — Historia del teatro. *Buenos Aires*: Edit. Atlántida, 1944. 254 pp.

Gil, I. M. — Poesía y Dolor. Ensayo [sobre Bécquer]. *Madrid*: Imp. Hispano-Americana, 1944. 45 pp.

Guardia, Alfredo de la. — García Lorca. Persona y creación. *Buenos Aires*: Schapire, 1944. 400 pp.

Herrero Mayor, Avelino. — Presente y futuro de la lengua española en América. *Buenos Aires*: El Ateneo, 1944. 238 pp.

— Problemas del idioma. *Ibid.*, 1944. 204 pp.

Isaacs, Jorge. — María, ed. R. H. Olmsted. *New York*: Oxford U. Press, 1944. 64 pp. \$0.30.

Klein Serrallés, Juan. — Eng.-Sp. and Sp.-Eng. Dict. of Aviation Terms. *New York*: McGraw, 1944. x + 131 pp. \$2.50.

Laso de la Vega, García (ed.). — Garcilaso de la Vega y Juan Boscán. Obras completas. *Madrid*: Aguilar, 1944. 636 pp.

Le Veque, Edward. — Easy Spanish. *Los Angeles*: Miles, 1944. vii + 48 pp. \$1.00.

Morales, Ernesto. — Historia del teatro argentino. *Buenos Aires*: Edit. Lautaro, 1944. 295 pp.

Pei, M. A. — Spanish. *New York*: Vanni, 1944. xiii + 52 pp. \$0.65.

Quevedo. — Visita de los chistes. Prólogo de A. Serrano Plaja. *Buenos Aires*: Edit Nova, 1944. 187 pp.

Rojas, F. de. — La Celestina, ed. F. Sáinz de Robles. *Madrid*: Aguilar, 1944. 496 pp.

Sáinz de Robles, F. C. — Esquema de una Historia de las Universidades españolas. *Madrid*: Aguilar, 1944. 536 pp.

Sell, L. L. — Eng.-Sp. Comprehensive Technical Dict. of aircraft, automobile, radio, etc. *New York*: McGraw, 1944. 1477 pp. \$30.00.

Sims, E. R. — Español esencial con historias. *Austin, Tex.*: Benson, 1944. xii + 372 pp. \$1.60.

Valbuena Prat, A. — Teatro moderno esp. *Zaragoza*: Eds. Partenón, 1944. 184 pp.

Zorrilla, José. — Poesías, ed. N. Alonso Cortés. *Madrid*: Espasa-Calpe, 1944. xx + 284 pp.

— Poesías varias, ed. M. de Montoliu. *Barcelona*: Montaner y Simón, 1944. xxxix + 392 pp.

1945

ricerche
ensiero,

Pidal.
e, 1944.

deñado.
101 pp.
teatro.
254 pp.
[sobre
ericana,

Lorea.
chapiro,

ente y
américa.
3 pp.
, 1944.

lmsted.
64 pp.

nd Sp.
York:

arcilaso
pletas.

h. Los
\$1.00.
teatro
autaro,

Vanni,

Prólogo
: Edit

. Sáinz
496 pp.
de una
pañolas.

e Tech-
radio,
477 pp.

storias.
372 pp.

no esp.
pp.
Alonso
. xx +

ontoliu.
. xxxix

CF

945

erche
ero,

dal.
944.

ndo.
pp.
tro.
pp.
bre
na,

rea.
ire,

y
ica.
.
944.

ed.
pp.

Sp-
rk:

aso
as.

Los
tro
ro,

ni,

go
nit

inz
pp.
na
as.

ch-
io,
pp.

as.
pp.

sp.

so
+

u.
ix

TRACTS AND PAMPHLETS

by RICHARD STEELE

EDITED WITH NOTES AND COMMENTARY BY RAE BLANCHARD

The reputation of Sir Richard Steele as a man of letters is secure in his essays and plays, and as promoter and editor of the influential *Tatler*, *Spectator*, and *Guardian*, his contribution to English social development is admittedly great. But his achievement in public life is commonly underrated, and one aspect of his journalism, his work as publicist and pamphleteer during the crucial years of the early eighteenth century, all but forgotten. For one reason his pamphlets are difficult of access. Although there were reissues of several at the close of the century, they are now rare in these as well as the earlier forms, and there has been no modern edition. For the first time, here in one volume are gathered together the thirty—or so—pieces constituting his known writings as a pamphleteer. In this collected edition, each one is accompanied by an introductory note outlining the occasion, a separate bibliography describing the various editions and translations, and a statement of the variant readings in the text.

It is in these tracts and pamphlets that the integrity of Steele's public life becomes clear. Touching as they do upon all important issues then before the English public, they are nevertheless unified by his passionate adherence to the principles of the Revolution of 1688—constitutional monarchy, religious toleration, personal and parliamentary liberty.

xvii + 663 pages, 29 facsimiles, Octavo. \$5.50.

THE JOHNS HOPKINS PRESS BALTIMORE 18

THE OWLES ALMANACKE

EDITED WITH AN INTRODUCTION

By DON CAMERON ALLEN

This anonymous satire by one of Dekker's disciples is the best parody of the serious prognostication before Swift's assault on Partridge. Published in 1618, it surpasses the limits of its five English predecessors by burlesquing the almanac in all of its gaudy departments. The pseudo-scientific manner of the astrologers, their insistence on classical origins, their love of precise instruments, their engagements with the muses of verse, and their fuzzy jargon are all ludicrously mocked. The latter part of the work, in which a series of prognostications are made for the London Companies, goes beyond the scope of the professional prognostication to intrude upon the realm of "character-books." Besides its satirical and literary values, *The Owles Almanacke* is an interesting document for the student of Jacobean times. It contains allusions to the theatrical and literary activities of the day, accounts of the modes and manners of contemporary life, and a gallery of ordinary Londoners that are seldom encountered in works prior to Dickens.

This satire has been edited from the three extant copies and provided with an introductory essay in which the editor attempts to supply a background for the reader by discussing the vogue of astrology and the history of the burlesque prognostication. To make the target of the satire less obscure, he has described a typical almanac and prognostication of the early seventeenth century.

Pp. vii + 103; 2 plates. Cloth, \$1.50.

THE JOHNS HOPKINS PRESS BALTIMORE

*A new scientific German text in the
Heath Visible Vocabulary Series*

Flechtner's DIE ELEMENTE

Edited by Lynwood G. Downs

On the elementary level, this little text, with the entire vocabulary of each page listed with English translations on the opposite page, serves as an introduction to chemical German.
64 pages. \$.40

Two other booklets in this series, Horn's *Der menschliche Körper* and Zipfel's *Bakterien und ansteckende Krankheiten*, have proved highly successful in enabling pre-medical students to read source materials in German at an early stage. The *Heath Visible Vocabulary Series* initiated this effective and agreeable method of vocabulary building.

D. C. HEATH AND COMPANY

BOSTON NEW YORK CHICAGO ATLANTA SAN FRANCISCO DALLAS LONDON

CONCISE FRENCH GRAMMAR

With Conversational Exercises

Swanson

A revision of this clear and concise presentation of the elements of French for college students. New conversational exercises have been added, and the book features an up-to-date, idiomatic vocabulary of practical value.

Henry Holt and Company

257 Fourth Avenue

New York 10